

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY • Social Security Administration • Washington, D. C.

Social Security Bulletin



October 1951

Volume 14

Number 10

New International Convention on Social Security

Prompt Payment of Assistance

THE SOCIAL SECURITY BULLETIN is published monthly under authority of Public Resolution No. 57, approved May 11, 1922 (42 Stat. 541), as amended by section 307, Public Act 212, Seventy-second Congress, approved June 30, 1932. The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (Sept. 11, 1950).

☆☆☆

The BULLETIN is prepared in the Division of Research and Statistics, Office of the Commissioner, Social Security Administration. It reports current data on operations of the Social Security Administration and the results of research and analysis pertinent to the social security program, and is issued primarily for distribution to agencies directly concerned with the administration of the Social Security Act. Statements in articles do not necessarily reflect final conclusions or official policies of the Social Security Administration. Any part of this publication may be reproduced with appropriate credit to the BULLETIN.

☆☆☆

The BULLETIN is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., to whom all purchase orders, with accompanying remittance, should be sent. The annual subscription is \$2.00 in the United States, Canada, and Mexico and \$2.75 in all other countries; price of single copy, 20 cents.

☆☆☆

The SOCIAL SECURITY YEARBOOK, an annual calendar-year supplement to the BULLETIN, was issued as a separate publication for the years 1939-48. Calendar-year data for later years will be published as an annual statistical supplement in each September issue of the BULLETIN. Most of the early issues of the YEARBOOK are available from the Superintendent of Documents as follows: 1939, 50 cents; 1940 and 1941, 70 cents each; 1942 and 1944, 50 cents each; other issues are out of print.

Social Security Bulletin



October 1951

Volume 14

Number 10

In this issue:

Social Security in Review:	Page
Program operations.....	1
Selected current statistics (table).....	2
New International Convention on Social Security, by Robert J. Myers.....	3
Prompt Payment of Assistance, by Victor D. Carlson and Wave L. Perry.....	9
Notes and Brief Reports:	
Improving State assistance payment procedures.....	12
OASI beneficiaries under old and new benefit levels.....	13
Social welfare expenditures in the United States.....	14
Recent Publications.....	16
Current Operating Statistics (tables).....	18

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

OSCAR R. EWING, *Administrator*

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

ARTHUR J. ALTMAYER, *Commissioner*

WILLIAM L. MITCHELL, *Deputy Commissioner*

Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance	Bureau of Federal Credit Unions
OSCAR C. POGGE, <i>Director</i>	CLAUDE R. ORCHARD, <i>Director</i>
Bureau of Public Assistance	Division of Research and Statistics
JANE M. HOEY, <i>Director</i>	I. S. FALK, <i>Director</i>
Children's Bureau	Division of the Actuary
MARTHA M. ELIOT, <i>Chief</i>	ROBERT J. MYERS, <i>Chief Actuary</i>
Appeals Council	
JOSEPH E. McELVAIN, <i>Chairman</i>	

Social Security in Review

UNDER the old-age and survivors insurance program, 4.1 million persons were receiving monthly benefits at the end of July—65,000 more than at the end of June. Three-fifths of this increase was accounted for by persons receiving old-age benefits and about one-fourth by other aged beneficiaries.

Monthly benefits being paid at the end of July totaled \$145.7 million. The average old-age benefit declined for the tenth consecutive month, to \$42.44; however, the decreases are becoming progressively smaller—17 cents in May, 16 cents in June, and 13 cents in July.

For all other types of benefits except parent's benefits the average amounts have shown a similar gradual downward trend since September 1950. The average parent's benefit in current-payment status increased slightly in both June and July. Average monthly benefits payable in July were as follows: wife's or husband's, \$22.89; child's, \$26.96; widow's or widower's, \$36.15; mother's, \$33.54; and parent's, \$36.70.

At the end of June 1951, monthly benefits were being withheld from almost 355,000 beneficiaries, 63,000 more than the December 1950 total. In 14,500 of these cases the beneficiary was self-employed, and 4,000 wife's or child's benefits were suspended because of the self-employment of the old-age beneficiaries on whose earnings the benefits were based. Beginning January 1, 1951, monthly benefits are not payable if the beneficiary (or, in the case of wife's or child's benefits, the old-age beneficiary on whose earnings the benefits are based), while under age 75, does substantial work as a self-employed person in a trade

or business covered by the Social Security Act as amended in 1950, and has net earnings from self-employment averaging more than \$50 a month for the taxable year.

The number of beneficiaries whose benefits were suspended because, while under age 75, they were working as employees for wages of more than \$50 a month increased by 32,000 during the 6-month period ended June 1951. This increase was proportional to the increase in the total number of beneficiaries on the rolls and reflects a continuance of good employment conditions. For all types of benefits combined, employment of the beneficiary or of the old-age beneficiary on whose wages the dependent's benefits are based accounted for 90 percent of all suspensions, while self-employment of the beneficiary or of the old-age beneficiary on whose earnings the dependent's benefits are based caused about 5 percent of the suspensions. A table showing a distribution of benefits withheld, by reason for withholding payment and type of benefit, appears on page 21.

THE NUMBER of cases receiving public assistance and the total expenditures for assistance again went down in July. Decreases in the number of cases helped by old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and general assistance more than offset the small increases in the number receiving aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. Total money payments to recipients for the month were more than \$1 million under the amount for June and were lower than in any other month since September 1949.

Aid to dependent children showed

the largest decreases, with declines of more than 14,000 in the number of families aided, nearly 36,000 in the number of children, and almost \$1.4 million in payments. The caseload for this program is usually somewhat smaller in the summer months, when more older children are employed and school expenses need not be included in the budget. In several States, however, lower appropriations forced the assistance agencies to adopt policies that reduced the number of recipients, the size of payments, or both.

Oregon suspended payments for July and August in behalf of all children 14 and 15 years old and for July-September for children aged 16 or older. Chiefly through this policy, the number of children aided was cut nearly one-fourth. The State agency has asked the local social workers to report the effects on the recipients of this temporary suspension of payments.

Florida tightened its eligibility requirements relating to deprivation of parental support and care, lowered from \$125 to \$81 the maximum amount that could be paid to a family, and reduced from 100 percent to 56 percent the proportion of the budget deficit on which payments are computed before the maximums are applied. The number of families receiving aid dropped nearly one-seventh and the average payment \$10.

The Ohio agency was forced to cut the State's share of payments for aid to dependent children and therefore authorized local agencies with insufficient funds to meet a reduced percentage of need. The average payment per family went down \$7. In New Mexico the percent of the budget deficit met by assistance was reduced on a State-

wide basis from 75 to 65 percent, decreasing the average payment by \$6. North Dakota reduced the average \$21 when it applied maximums beginning at \$35 each for the first two recipients in a family.

The Delaware agency, on the other hand, was able to raise its maximums, thus restoring earlier reductions in payments and raising the average per family by \$9. Increases of approximately \$5 a family were made in Illinois and Minnesota.

The decrease in general assistance cases in July was approximately 11,000, and the reduction in payments was about \$600,000. As usual, State changes varied in size and in direction, with the largest percentage changes in States with comparatively small caseloads. Comments by State assistance agencies on the reasons for the changes mentioned some lay-offs in civilian production around Detroit without corresponding increase in defense production; good employment opportunities on the West Coast and in Hawaii; and, in Pennsylvania, more job opportunities than would usually be expected in July.

In old-age assistance as in aid to dependent children and general assistance, caseloads decreased slightly in July in most States. The total number of recipients was about 8,000 less than in June. A decrease of 13 percent in Idaho reflects, primarily, the effect of a new law making a lien on real property a condition for the receipt of assistance. The total amount of old-age assistance payments in all States was higher than in June. Kentucky's increase of \$613,000 nearly equaled the increase for the Nation; the average per recipient in that State rose \$9 because payments were computed on 100 percent instead of 69 percent of the budget deficit, and the maximum was raised from \$40 to \$50.

About half the States reported very small decreases in the number of recipients of aid to the blind and in their average payment; similar increases in other States nearly canceled these rises so that little change occurred in the totals.

The number of recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled and the amount of payments rose slightly as the result of expansion of the program in the 31 States that have

Selected current statistics

[Corrected to Sept. 6, 1951]

Item	July 1951	June 1951	July 1950	Calendar year	
				1950	1949
<i>Labor Force ¹ (in thousands)</i>					
Total civilian.....	64,382	63,783	64,427	63,099	62,105
Employed.....	62,526	61,803	61,214	59,957	58,710
Covered by old-age and survivors insurance ²		45,600	35,483	35,165	34,314
Covered by State unemployment insurance ³	34,400	34,500	33,000	32,800	31,581
Unemployed.....	1,856	1,980	3,213	3,142	3,395
<i>Personal Income ⁴ (in billions; seasonally adjusted at annual rates)</i>					
Total.....	\$251.6	\$251.0	\$220.7	\$224.7	\$205.1
Employees' income ⁵	169.3	169.6	144.6	145.8	133.8
Proprietors' and rental income.....	49.3	48.0	45.5	44.0	41.4
Personal interest income and dividends.....	19.8	20.0	17.8	19.3	17.1
Public aid ⁶	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.2
Social insurance and related payments ⁷	7.0	7.0	6.1	6.5	6.8
Veterans' subsistence allowances ⁸ and bonuses.....	1.1	1.3	2.3	2.2	2.0
Miscellaneous income payments ⁹	2.8	2.8	2.0	4.5	1.8
<i>Old-Age and Survivors Insurance</i>					
Monthly benefits:					
Current-payment status: ¹⁰					
Number (in thousands).....	4,099	4,034	2,946		
Amount (in thousands).....	\$145,720	\$143,709	\$61,125	\$1,018,149	\$655,852
Average primary benefit.....	\$48.44	\$42.67	\$26.53		
Awards (in thousands):					
Number.....	103	109	41	963	682
Amount.....	\$3,198	\$3,310	\$924	\$26,234	\$15,343
<i>Unemployment Insurance ¹¹</i>					
Initial claims (in thousands).....	1,061	837	944	12,251	17,660
Weeks of unemployment claimed (in thousands).....	4,331	4,019	5,992	78,654	102,612
Weeks compensated (in thousands).....	3,290	3,450	5,019	67,860	86,638
Weekly average beneficiaries (in thousands).....	748	821	1,158	1,304	1,666
Benefits paid (in millions) ¹²	\$66	\$69	\$100	\$1,373	\$1,737
Average weekly payment for total unemployment.....	\$80.69	\$80.69	\$80.55	\$80.76	\$80.47
<i>Public Assistance</i>					
Recipients (in thousands):					
Old-age assistance.....	2,738	2,745	2,797		
Aid to dependent children:					
Families.....	618	632	653		
Children.....	1,582	1,618	1,658		
Aid to the blind.....	97	97	96		
Aid to the permanently and totally disabled ¹³	109	104			
General assistance.....	324	335	499		
Average payments:					
Old-age assistance.....	\$45.58	\$45.23	\$45.55		
Aid to dependent children (per family).....	78.78	73.38	70.15		
Aid to the blind.....	46.66	46.77	45.80		
Aid to the permanently and totally disabled.....	44.61	44.87			
General assistance.....	44.61	44.97	45.44		

¹ Continental United States only. Estimated by the Bureau of the Census, except as noted. Monthly employment figures represent specific week and annual figures, average week (unemployment insurance data represent pay period instead of week).

² Estimated by the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance. Data for July 1951 not available.

³ Data from the Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor.

⁴ Data from the Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce. Continental United States, except for employees' income, which includes pay of Federal civilian and military personnel in all areas.

⁵ Civilian and military pay in cash and in kind, other labor income (except workmen's compensation), mustering-out pay, terminal-leave pay, and Government contributions to allowances for dependents of enlisted personnel. Excludes employee contributions under social insurance and related programs.

⁶ Payments to recipients under the 4 special public assistance programs and general assistance.

⁷ Includes old-age and survivors insurance benefits; railroad, Federal, State, and local retirement benefits; veterans' pensions and compensation; workmen's compensation; State and railroad unemployment insurance and temporary disability benefits; and readjustment allowances to veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

⁸ Under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

⁹ Includes payments under the Government life insurance, national service life insurance, and military and naval insurance programs, the Government contribution to nonprofit organizations, business transfer payments, and recoveries under the Employer's Liability Act for railroad workers and seamen.

¹⁰ Benefit in current-payment status is subject to no deduction or only to deduction of fixed amount that is less than the current month's benefit.

¹¹ Monthly amounts, gross; annual amounts adjusted for voided benefit checks and benefit refunds.

¹² Program initiated October 1950.

given such aid since May. In Vermont, the average payment increased \$19. Although this State established its

program in January, payments continued until July at the same amounts

(Continued on page 19)

New International Convention on Social Security

by ROBERT J. MYERS*

ONE of the major topics placed on the agenda of the Thirty-fourth Session of the International Labor Conference held in Geneva from June 6 to 30, 1951, was "Objectives and Minimum Standards of Social Security." This action represented another step forward in the development of a new international Convention on social security. The procedure leading up to the official adoption of an International Labor Organization Convention is very thorough and accordingly very lengthy. This article will review the action taken and give a description of the contents of the tentative Convention.

Forms of International Instruments

Under the set-up of the International Labor Organization, two forms of international instruments are used—Conventions and Recommendations. In brief, a Convention prescribes certain specific standards that a country must meet in order that it may ratify the Convention¹ and live up to the international obligation thus undertaken. Ratification also involves the responsibility of continued statistical and other reporting as to the country's experience in the particular subject dealt with by the Convention—in part, so that the experience may be made known to other countries and, in part, to indicate continued compliance with the Convention. A Recommendation—as its name implies—merely makes suggestions and gives advice to the various countries on the problems involved in the subject matter under consideration.

Need for a New Instrument

The subject matter of social security has for some time been in need of discussion by the International Labor Conference. Before World War II, there were a number of Recommendations

and Conventions (none of which the United States had ratified), each dealing with a separate branch or subdivision of *social insurance*. In the past two decades, however, the broader concept of *social security* has evolved.

Social insurance usually applied to employees only and frequently contained many private insurance concepts undesirable in a truly social system. Benefits, for example, were related rather closely to those actuarially purchased by each individual's contributions rather than to at least presumed subsistence needs. During the depression years of the 1930's the need for a broader approach encompassing the entire working population, or even the entire population, seemed desirable to many countries.

Furthermore, where the social insurance principle had been maintained or adopted, it seemed necessary to review social assistance (that is, public assistance) in order to have a closer coordination between social insurance and social assistance. This broader scope has come to be called social security. With the advent of social security systems and proposals in many countries, the existing Conventions were not adequate to meet the actual situation developing, and a review was necessary.

Previous Steps

Although the development of new international instruments and the modification of existing ones are continuing processes with the International Labor Organization, the first beginnings of the material considered by the latest International Labor Conference had developed at the Twenty-sixth Session of the Conference in Philadelphia in 1944.²

The earlier Conference adopted two Recommendations—one on income security and one on medical care. These Recommendations, in their

general terms, took into account the new concept of social security that had recently been developing. In the discussion at the Conference it was pointed out that, after there was more actual experience with these new programs—many of which were only in draft legislative form and were not in effect—converting the Recommendations into Conventions could be considered.

The next step was the consideration of the subject by the International Labor Organization's Committee of Social Security Experts. This Committee is composed of 28 experts from 24 different countries; in general, the experts are administrators or technicians of social security organizations and serve in their individual capacities rather than as official representatives of their countries.³

The officers of the Committee, at a meeting in October 1949, recognized the need for a revision of the existing Conventions on social security and recommended that such action should be taken. After the Governing Body of the International Labor Organization had approved the recommendation and placed the subject on the agenda of the 1951 Session of the Conference, the entire Committee of Social Security Experts met in February 1950 and considered a first draft of the questionnaire, which had been prepared by the International Labor Office. The Committee revised this questionnaire, which was then circulated to the various Governments.⁴ The questionnaire was framed on

³ Arthur J. Altmeyer, Commissioner for Social Security, and the author were members of the Committee during its discussion of this subject.

⁴ The questionnaire, with a review of legislation and practice in various countries, is contained in *Report IV(1): Objectives and Minimum Standards of Social Security*, International Labor Conference, 34th Session, 1951 (ILO, 1950). Supplementing the material was a detailed report summarizing the social security systems of all member countries (*International Survey of Social Security* (Studies and Reports, N.S. No. 23, ILO, 1950)).

* Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration.

¹ In the United States, ratification of a Convention is accomplished by action of the Senate.

² For a detailed description of this meeting and its conclusions, see Wilbur J. Cohen and Jessica H. Barr, "The 1944 International Labor Conference," *Social Security Bulletin*, June 1944.

Summary of minimum standards in tentative Convention

Branch	Contingencies provided for	Coverage ¹	Qualifying conditions	Amount of benefits ²	Duration of benefits
Medical benefits.....	For covered person and his wife and children, all morbid conditions, and pregnancy.	20% of all residents..	Period of contributions, employment, or residence. ³	General practitioner care, specialist care at hospitals, hospitalization, and essential medicines; maternity care by midwife at least.	26 weeks in each case (52 weeks if disease requires prolonged care and can be cured). ⁴
Sickness allowances.....	Incapacity for work due to sickness and loss of earnings.	20% of all residents..	Period of contributions, employment, or residence. ³	40% for man, wife, and 2 children.	26 weeks in each case, with 3-day waiting period. ⁵
Unemployment allowances..	Loss of earnings due to unemployment if able to work.	50% of all employees..	Period of contributions, employment, or residence. ³	40% for man, wife, and 2 children.	Three alternatives: Benefit days Waiting period in year (days) 78 3 per case 78 9 cumulative 156 7 per case
Old-age pensions.....	Age 65 ⁶ and retirement...	20% of all residents..	30 years of contributions, or 20 years of residence, or yearly average of contributions required. ⁷	30% for man and wife of pensionable age.	For life.
Employment injury benefits.	Morbid conditions resulting from employment, and resulting loss of earnings.	50% of all employees..	Employed at time of injury.	Complete medical care; ⁸ invalidity, sickness, and survivor benefits same as in each of these branches.	Medical care as long as needed; sickness benefits, 26 weeks, with 3-day waiting period; for invalidity and survivor benefits, same as in each of these branches.
Family allowances.....	Responsibility for 2 or more children.	20% of all residents..	3 months of contributions or employment, or 1 year of residence.	Flat benefit of 5% of earnings of typical unskilled worker for each child after the first.	Until children attain school-leaving age.
Maternity benefits.....	Pregnancy and confinement for women workers and wives of men workers; in addition, for women workers, resulting loss of earnings.	20% of all residents..	Period of contributions, employment, or residence. ³	40% for woman worker; medical care as in medical benefits branch.	Medical care as long as needed; cash allowances for 12 weeks.
Invalidity pensions.....	Presumably permanent invalidity—inability to engage in any gainful occupation.	20% of all residents..	5 years of contributions or employment, or 10 years of residence.	30% for man, wife, and 2 children.	For duration of invalidity, with such waiting period as necessary for determination of invalidity.
Survivor pensions.....	Presumed incapacity of widow and orphan children for self-support.	20% of all residents..	5 years of residence, contributions, or employment; ⁹ additional requirements for widow without children. ¹⁰	30% for widow and 2 children.	Until children attain school-leaving age or, for widow, until remarriage.

¹ Percentages indicated are a measurement of the minimum coverage permissible; such coverage is to be obtained from selected classes of gainfully occupied persons (except for unemployment allowances and employment injury branches, which relate only to employees). Alternatively, the system may cover all residents, except for maternity benefits branch. Underdeveloped countries may temporarily cover groups making up at least 50 percent of employees in firms of not less than 20 employees.

² For cash benefits other than family allowances, percentages shown relate either (a) to individual average earnings (up to prescribed maximum of the earnings of a typical skilled worker) or (b) to a flat benefit, based on the prescribed proportion of earnings of a typical unskilled worker; as an alternative, for plans with a needs test, covering all residents, benefit must be determined from a fixed scale, but from such amount there may be deducted means of the family in excess of a substantial amount (but total of benefit and means taken into account must be sufficient to maintain in health and decency and must at least equal benefit under (b)).

³ Sufficiently long, considering the scope of the system, to prevent abuse.

⁴ As temporary exception for underdeveloped countries, 13 weeks in each case.

⁵ As temporary exception for underdeveloped countries, such shorter period as will result in benefits paid for an average of 10 days per person covered.

⁶ Higher age is permitted for a system if ratio of those over specified age to those under that age but over age 15 is at least 10 percent.

⁷ Reduced benefits must be available to those who have at least half of these requirements.

⁸ As temporary exception, underdeveloped countries may provide same medical care as in medical benefits branch.

⁹ For contributions and employment, longer period may be required as proof of status as an employee.

¹⁰ Specified length of marriage, 5 years of residence, and at least a certain prescribed age at widowhood.

the general basis of setting up two standards, one minimum and the other more advanced, which might be said to represent ultimate objectives.

After the Office had received replies from the various Governments a preliminary draft of the instrument was drawn up for the consideration of the coming Conference.⁵ On the basis of the replies the Office modified the original material developed previously

⁵ The replies, an analysis of them, and the preliminary draft of the instrument are contained in *Report IV(2): Objectives and Minimum Standards of Social Security*, International Labor Conference, 34th Session, 1951 (ILO, 1951).

to give weight to the majority views expressed. The resulting document took the form of a Convention covering all branches of social security, with, of course, individual and specific details for each.

Ratification of the Convention would be possible if a country had in existence at least three qualifying branches out of a total of nine (general medical care; health insurance and cash sickness benefits; unemployment benefits; old-age benefits; workmen's compensation; family allowances; maternity care and benefits; invalidity benefits; and survivor benefits). Moreover, at least two of the branches would have to be from the

first six listed. For each branch, ratification would be at two levels—a minimum standard and an advanced standard.

For countries with a Federal form of government, special provision was made in regard to branches under the jurisdiction of their constituent units. In order to ratify, the Central Government would, in effect, be required both to certify that the required number of constituent units were in compliance at the time of ratification and to guarantee that they would continue to comply.

The specific details of the tentative instrument will be discussed later in the article in connection with the con-

clusions adopted by the Conference, and the more important changes made from the original document will be given.

General Position of the United States Government

From the viewpoint of the United States Government, changes seemed essential at three major points. There was, moreover, the question of form: should the instrument be a Recommendation or a Convention, and should there be a distinction between the minimum and advanced standards. The answer to these questions was dependent, however, on action taken on other matters.

One major point concerned the first two branches—(a) general medical care and (b) health insurance combined with cash sickness benefits. The general medical care branch contemplates a public medical service like that in Great Britain. A health insurance program such as that recommended by President Truman would not be able to qualify under the general medical care branch since it would not relate to the entire population but only to the insured working population and specified dependents. On the other hand, such a health insurance program could qualify under the second branch of the proposed Convention, but only if cash sickness benefits were included. Likewise, a cash sickness benefits system could not qualify unless it were combined with a health insurance plan. There seems to be no reason that these two programs, health insurance and cash sickness benefits, should be combined in one branch; although many countries do administer those two branches together, there are others that do not. Accordingly, the United States Government position was to have the first branch modified so that a health insurance plan could qualify and to have the second branch encompass only cash sickness benefits.

The second major point related to the number of branches required to ratify the Convention, if the instrument took the form of a convention. Because of the difficulties arising from the clause dealing with the Federal States, it seemed unlikely that the United States would be able to ratify on the basis of three branches; in ac-

tuality, it would appear that only two branches on a national level would be possible of ratification, namely old-age benefits and survivors benefits. Moreover, from a theoretical standpoint it seems illogical to require any specified number of branches. It does seem logical, rather, that ratification be on the basis of only one branch; the country, of course, would have the incentive of ratifying as many more branches as it could for the sake of prestige and recorded achievement. Thus, the journey of nine possible steps might be made, with the start being made with one step rather than an initial jump of three.

The third major point centered on the special clause for Federal States. The United States Government position was that this clause was undesirable as a general principle, since the provisions of Article 19, paragraph 7, of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization should hold in all such cases. This paragraph provides that where action on a particular matter is appropriate in whole or in part for the constituent units, the Federal Government should in general serve as liaison and coordinating agency with these units so that they may take the necessary action. Moreover, the United States could not ratify on the basis of this particular clause if it were interpreted as constituting a "guarantee" of continued compliance by the States.

Organization of the Conference

At the fourth sitting of the Conference (on June 8, 1951) a Committee on Social Security was set up. It consisted of 80 members—40 from Governments, 20 representing the employers, and 20 representing the workers.⁶

As is customary in International

⁶ The United States representatives were Arthur J. Altmeyer for the Government (with the author as a substitute); Charles P. McCormick of McCormick and Company for the employers (with A. D. Marshall of the General Electric Company and Charles B. Shaw of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey as substitutes); and Jacob S. Potofsky of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO, for the workers (with Martin Kyne of the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, CIO, as deputy member).

Labor Conferences, each of the employer members and each of the worker members had two votes, so that there was an equal tripartite division of the votes between the three groups. The Committee elected Pierre Laroque, French Government member, as Chairman, with the Vice-Chairmen being Fernando Yllanes Ramos, Mexican employer member, and Edward Stark, Austrian worker member; the Reporter was Cyril G. Dennys, Government member for the United Kingdom.

The Committee held 17 meetings, and in addition there were numerous separate meetings of each of the three groups. Because of insufficient time the Committee was able to consider only the minimum standards, which it was decided should be presented in the form of a Convention. Under the customary procedure, the Convention will be on next year's agenda for final consideration. The Committee also recommended that the advanced standards be placed on next year's agenda for a first discussion and that the Governing Body should consider holding an advance tripartite technical preparatory conference to expedite next year's session.

The Committee prepared a report⁷ presenting both a general résumé of the discussions it had held and a revised form of the international instrument. This report was adopted unanimously as reflecting the majority decisions of the Committee, although, as will be described later, certain groups were in disagreement with some of the conclusions adopted. At its twenty-third and twenty-fourth sittings, on June 28, 1951, the Conference as a whole considered the Report of the Committee on Social Security⁸ and adopted its conclusions by a vote of 122 to 23. In subsequent voting, similar large majorities supported resolutions to place the Minimum Standards Convention on next year's agenda for a final discussion, to place the subject of advanced standards on next year's agenda for a first discussion, and to invite the Governing Body

⁷ International Labor Conference, 34th Session, 1951, *Provisional Record No. 28*.

⁸ International Labor Conference, 34th Session, 1951, *Provisional Records No. 33 and 34*.

to consider holding a preparatory conference before next year's session.

Provisions of the Proposed Convention

The accompanying chart summarizes the general provisions of the proposed Minimum Standards Convention by indicating separately for each branch the risks against which protection is provided, the coverage, qualifying conditions, amount of benefits, and duration of benefits. The first two branches are different from those in the original form of the instrument; the first branch, medical benefits, includes not only general medical care programs for the entire population but also health insurance systems, while the second branch is composed solely of cash sickness benefits. This change was made in line with the first major position point of the United States Government mentioned previously. The basis of ratification was left unchanged, however; three branches will be necessary and at least two must be from the first six branches. Thus, the second major point raised by the United States Government was not concurred in.

An attempt was made to obtain specific statistical bases for various requirements and provisions in as many instances as possible and at the same time to leave sufficient flexibility for various types of programs. Several of these statistical bases are worthy of consideration at this point.

Throughout it should be kept in mind that the various requirements shown are minimum ones and that any country can ratify if it provides larger benefits or less restrictive conditions of any sort. For the maternity benefits branch, for instance, the medical care provided for both dependent wives and women workers must be furnished "at least by qualified midwives and, if necessary, by medical practitioners." This requirement would not mean that a country must prescribe midwife care but rather that, if a country adopts the more advanced basis of prescribing a medical practitioner in all cases, the requirement would be met.

As another instance, the qualifying condition for old-age pensions is 30 years of contributions, or 20 years of

residence, or "the yearly average number of contributions prescribed by national laws or regulations."⁹ This condition would be fulfilled if a country had a much lower requirement as, for instance, in the old-age and survivors insurance program in the United States where, depending upon the individual's age in 1950, only 1½ to 10 years of contributions are in effect required.

As a further example, for survivor pensions the proposed Convention requires that such benefits shall be paid to a widow under either of two circumstances: (1) if she has children under school-leaving age at the time she becomes widowed (and then the benefits are to be paid only as long as the children are under that age), or (2) if she has no children, benefits are to be paid only if she is over a certain prescribed age at widowhood, had been married for a certain prescribed length of time, and she or her husband had met certain requirements as to length of contributions, employment, or residence. A country could ratify if it eliminated or lowered these requirements—for instance, if benefits were paid to the widow, regardless of whether she had children and regardless of her age at widowhood. The old-age and survivors insurance program in the United States would more than meet the conditions, since widows receive benefits not only while they have children in their care but also at age 65 regardless of their age when they were widowed.

One of the alternative coverage requirements for all branches except unemployment allowances and employment injury benefits is that coverage must apply to at least 20 percent of all residents in a country. Customarily, the extent of coverage of a social security program is determined by relating it to the total employed civilian labor force. In the United States, for example, old-age and survivors insurance coverage in an average week is perhaps 45 million, or 75 percent of the total employed civilian labor force. Under the proposed Conven-

⁹ One example of the last alternative is the British system under which, in general, full old-age pensions are paid only if the yearly average number of weekly contributions paid or credited since the inception of the plan is 50 or more.

tion, however, coverage is not related to the labor force, but rather to total population—a not precisely comparable base. When old-age and survivors insurance coverage is related to the total United States population of about 155 million, the proportion covered represents 29 percent, which is well in excess of the minimum requirement of 20 percent. Even if old-age and survivors insurance covered all the labor force (including the armed forces), the ratio would be only about 40 percent, so that it may be seen that the 20-percent requirement, although at first glance seeming to be rather low, in actuality requires rather extensive coverage.

The minimum retirement age for old-age pensions is set at 65, although a higher age is permitted for the system if the ratio of those over the specified age to those under that age but over age 15 is at least 10 percent. In other words, if a minimum retirement age of 67 were desired, compliance with the Convention would be possible only if the ratio of those aged 67 and over to those aged 15–66 was at least 10 percent. This concept can be measured quite simply for plans covering the entire population. Thus, for the 1950 population of the United States,¹⁰ the ratio for persons at and above the retirement age of 65 is 12.6 percent, so that the 10-percent standard would readily be met for that age. In fact, on this basis, a retirement age of about 67½ would just meet this standard, while in the future, as the population ages, an even higher age would be permissible.

Three bases are established for the amount of the cash benefits under the Minimum Standards Convention. Under two bases, benefit rates related to certain specified earnings are developed for particular standard beneficiary groups (as shown in the chart), and, presumably, comparable percentages would be applicable for other beneficiary groups within the same branch. In general, these benefit percentages are 30 percent for long-range benefits, such as old-age, invalidity,

¹⁰ Based on preliminary 1950 Census data from a 0.1-percent sample, *1950 Census of Population, Preliminary Reports*, Series PC-7, No. 1, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Feb. 25, 1951.

and survivor benefits, and 40 percent for short-range benefits—for example, unemployment, sickness, and maternity benefits. One of the most important substantive changes from the original form of the instrument was the lowering of percentages by 10 points (originally they were 40 percent and 50 percent, respectively) so that countries could more readily meet the standards established.

One of the two bases would relate these percentages to individual average earnings but permit earnings in excess of a prescribed maximum—the earnings rate of a typical skilled worker—to be disregarded. This basis is used in the old-age and survivors insurance program of the United States, where benefits are determined from an average wage excluding earnings in excess of \$3,600 a year.

There is no requirement in the proposed Convention that there be any minimum provisions or weighting in the benefit formula so that lower-paid workers receive relatively larger benefits than higher-paid workers within the maximum earnings range. Rather, for example, for old-age pensions the benefit requirement is a fixed 30 percent of the average wage when both man and wife are over the minimum pensionable age. Under the United States old-age and survivors insurance system, if the average monthly wage is \$100 or less, the benefit for a married couple when the wife is eligible amounts to 75 percent of the average wage (and even more in those instances where the minimum benefit provisions apply); at the other extreme, when the average monthly wage is the maximum of \$300, the combined benefit for husband and wife represents 40 percent of the average wage. Accordingly, this provision of the proposed Convention is quite readily met by the United States old-age and survivors insurance system. Similarly, the requirement for survivor pensions—a 30-percent benefit for a widow and two children—is more than met by the corresponding figures for the old-age and survivors insurance system, which range from 80 percent for the lower-paid insured persons down to 50 percent for those with maximum earnings.

The other basis that uses the benefit percentages involves flat benefits.

The size of these benefits is fixed at a given percentage of the earnings of a typical unskilled worker. This basis would be used as a measuring stick to determine the conformity of a plan such as that in Great Britain, where, under the legislation recently enacted,¹¹ an eligible husband and wife receive 50s., or £2½, a week. The average earnings of an unskilled laborer in Great Britain are probably about £4 or £5 a week, so that the benefit is 50 to 60 percent thereof, or well above the minimum standard of 30 percent. If such a system were in effect in the United States, to conform with the requirement of the Convention the combined benefit for husband and wife would have to be at least \$9 a week, or \$39 a month.¹²

The third basis for the amount of cash benefits is applicable only to plans covering all residents. Under this basis the benefit must be determined according to a fixed scale but may be reduced to the extent by which the means of the family exceed a prescribed substantial amount. There is the further limitation, however, that the total amount of the benefit and any means taken into account must be sufficient to maintain the family in health and decency and must not be less than the amount of benefit determined on the second basis.

A typical example of a system of this kind is that in New Zealand, under which an eligible husband and wife receive a weekly pension of £5¼.¹³ This amount is reduced, however, by a means test, which disregards such assets as the home and its furnishings, other assets up to £1,000, and weekly income of £1½ or less. When the cost of living and the standard of living in New Zealand are considered, the total of the benefit and any means taken into account is far more than sufficient for maintenance of health and decency and is well above 30 percent of the earnings of an unskilled worker, which are roughly £7 per week.

¹¹ National Insurance Act, 1951 (ch. 4), assented to June 22, 1951 (effective September 1951).

¹² Based on a 40-hour workweek and assumed wage for an unskilled worker of 75 cents per hour, which is the minimum wage in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

¹³ Based on provisions in effect since February 1951.

Exceptions for Underdeveloped Countries

As indicated in the table, a number of temporary exceptions are permitted for countries whose economy and medical facilities are insufficiently developed. The determination of the exception is made by the member itself, and as long as the country wishes to use this exception, it must so state in its annual report. It may be observed that the coverage requirements particularly are modified for underdeveloped countries so that they can begin a social security system by covering only certain groups of employees in moderate-sized and large work establishments. Some exception of this kind is necessary for a country such as India, which has a population of about 500 million and, if it were not for this exception, would have to have a coverage of 100 million in order to ratify!

Voluntary Insurance Systems

Ratification is permitted on the basis of a voluntary insurance system that is both supervised and subsidized by the Government; the various requirements described previously must be met, and certain other requirements must also be satisfied. Contributions of insured persons cannot be more than 75 percent of the expected cost of the system, with the remainder being made up either by the employers or by the Government.¹⁴ Further, the voluntary system must cover in the aggregate a substantial portion of the workers eligible for coverage whose earnings are less than those of a typical skilled manual worker. In the vote in the Committee on Social Security as to whether, for purposes of ratification, voluntary insurance must be subsidized by public authorities, the representative of the United States Government voted in opposition.¹⁵

Treatment of Aliens

To permit ratification a system must provide that alien residents receive

¹⁴ In compulsory insurance systems the employee may not contribute more than 50 percent of the expected cost of the system.

¹⁵ International Labor Conference, 34th Session, 1951, *Provisional Record No. 34*, p. 424.

the same treatment as citizens, except that a residence requirement may be imposed when a system does not make payment of benefits conditional on a minimum period of contributions or employment. There is no restriction, however, against different treatment for citizens who leave the particular country and reside elsewhere and for aliens. Under the United States old-age and survivors insurance system, benefits are paid in similar fashion to citizens whether they live in the United States or elsewhere and to aliens. Further, this program imposes no residence requirement; for aliens, such a requirement would not, of course, be permissible under the provisions of the Convention, since qualification depends on a minimum period of employment.

Individual Sharing in Cost of Medical Benefits

For the various medical care benefits provided, the insured person may be required to pay up to one-third of the cost in his individual case, provided that this payment does not involve hardship. No such cost-sharing is permitted, however, with respect to maternity, employment injury, and diseases likely to be cured but known to involve prolonged care. Thus, a system could require that the insured person pay the entire cost of inexpensive medicines, since in the aggregate they would involve less than one-third of the total costs in his individual case. Such a procedure, of course, might be advisable to prevent abuse and to eliminate expensive administrative procedures in connection with relatively small financial expenditures, which could readily be borne by the insured person.

Financing Aggregate Costs

As to financing, there are general provisions that the method adopted should avoid hardship for low-income persons and that any specific method should be determined in the light of the economic and financial situation of both the country and the persons covered. With respect to compulsory insurance systems under which only employees are insured, the insured persons shall not be required to contribute more than half the expected

cost of the benefits and administration. Further, the Government should accept general responsibility for the solvency of the system, including any voluntary plans.¹⁶

Right of Appeal

There are included in the Convention certain minimum provisions granting the right to appeal, with special independent tribunals.

Federal Government Clause

Federal States may ratify branches that are under the jurisdiction of their constituent units. The Central Government would have to certify that the required number of constituent units are currently providing plans that satisfy the general conditions and would have to report on them annually in the future. The required number of constituent units may be determined by alternative methods. Either there can be any number of such units so long as the aggregate number of persons protected complies with the general provisions; or at least two-thirds of the constituent units have such plans, with each plan complying with the coverage requirement as measured independently for the constituent unit.¹⁷ Although this clause is modified from the original form in that it no longer involves the possible "guarantee of continuance" of each constituent unit (as discussed previously), it still does not meet the primary objection of the United States Government position—that a special clause for Federal States is undesirable as a general principle

¹⁶ In particular, the Governments are to make actuarial studies and calculations as to the financial equilibrium of the system periodically and in any event before any change in the contribution rate is made.

¹⁷ For example, if the United States desired ratification for a plan solely under the auspices of the States, such as the unemployment allowances branch (unemployment insurance), it would be possible if either (a) the aggregate coverage was 20 percent of the total population or about 31 million, or (b) 39 States had plans, with coverage in each case at least equal to 20 percent of the State's population. As to this coverage requirement, the United States could definitely qualify on the first alternative since the aggregate coverage is about 34 million (as of the middle of 1951) and on the second as well since all States have such programs.

since the customary provisions of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization should apply in all Conventions.

Positions of the Employers and the Workers

The employer members took a position against any action leading to a general Convention. They believed that there should be separate Conventions for each branch and possibly a general Recommendation covering the entire subject. Further, they were opposed to having a minimum standard and an advanced standard, which they considered would be incompatible with the customary procedure of having specific and comparable international obligations. The group also believed that the considerations should not extend to plans covering the entire population, or even to gainfully occupied persons other than employees, since such consideration would be beyond the competence of the Organization, which is concerned solely with employer-employee matters. Further, the employer members held that voluntary insurance systems regulated by the Government should be considered for qualifying purposes under the instrument, regardless of whether there was subsidization by the Government.

On the whole, the worker representatives were satisfied with the original text but willingly made a number of compromises desired by the other groups. They felt strongly, however, that the instrument should be a Convention and that there should be a differentiation between minimum and advanced standards. Accordingly, they believed that the principle of the new document should be adopted and approved.

Votes of the United States Government

The United States Government voted in favor of using the general conclusions of the report made by the Committee on Social Security as a basis for the consultation of Governments and also voted in favor of placing on next year's agenda both the subject of minimum standards for a view to a final decision as to a Con-

(Continued on page 24)

Prompt Payment of Assistance

by VICTOR D. CARLSON and WAVE L. PERRY*

Among the 1950 amendments to the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act are provisions that clarify and greatly strengthen a claimant's right—always assumed though not until now expressed in the law—to apply for and, if eligible, to receive aid with reasonable promptness. The article discusses some of the difficulties encountered by the States in achieving promptness and the way some of these difficulties have been overcome by States in Region IX.¹

PEOPLE in need who seek public help to meet that need should—if they are eligible—receive payment promptly. No one can properly question such a principle, and no one does; yet today, 15 years after the passage of the Social Security Act, policies and procedures to achieve this principle are not fully in operation.

In the early days, delays were inevitable. The Federal-State assistance programs were established during the depression of the thirties when need was especially acute. In almost every community, there was a backlog of potential applications that became pending applications as soon as the local public assistance agencies opened their doors. Many local agencies were new, and few were adequately equipped and staffed to handle applications speedily. Lack of funds also handicapped many agencies, and "waiting lists" of pending applications piled up.

Although these early conditions affecting prompt action have largely disappeared, long delays are still far too common. The Bureau of Public Assistance has been concerned for some time about the continuance of delays and has frequently called the attention of State agencies to the need for greater promptness. The States, too, were aware of the problem and how it had arisen. They had used a

justifiable caution in setting up payment procedures, realizing that the emphasis must be placed on the process of determining eligibility if the aim of the programs—aid to the genuinely needy—was to be achieved. As a result, the entire process had become hedged around with detailed procedures, and a pattern that seemed impossible to break was set up. Congress became concerned about the lack of promptness in making payments to eligible claimants and in 1950 amended the Social Security Act to clarify the right to apply and to receive prompt action, including payment if the claimant is eligible.

Certain reasons underlie the continued failure to accomplish prompt payment of assistance in the Federal-State programs. For one thing, there has been an inclination to think of the categorical assistance programs as long-time security programs rather than assistance programs designed to meet emergent and immediate need. As a result, in many States the concept developed that a person cannot be found eligible and payment made without a detailed and time-consuming investigation. It was believed that, once the person was placed on the rolls, he probably would never leave them until some factor of eligibility other than need rendered him ineligible.

Coupled with this attitude has sometimes been the belief that many individuals applying for assistance under the Federal-State programs do not need immediate help because they have, either in cash or in kind, some reserves that can be used while their cases are being processed. In addition, the argument has frequently been put forth that, where there are no such

reserves and need is urgent, the general assistance program can give interim assistance. The validity of these and other similar concepts and attitudes needs to be examined carefully.

One cause for the development of methods since found to be unproductive was an early and rather widespread misconception of the nature of public assistance administration. Because the determination of eligibility is the basis for authorizing individual payments, the process was regarded as primarily fiscal. Its review was therefore assigned to auditors rather than to persons with the technical skills required to make a sound appraisal of social work processes. The Federal Government had some share in promoting this early misconception and the resulting unsatisfactory methods. State personnel who were working in the programs in their beginning will recall the close scrutiny to which each individual case was subjected by Federal and State auditors and the questions raised if procedures had not been followed exactly.

As the nature of the process became better understood, however, means were found for a more constructive appraisal of cases and administrative practices; it began to be recognized that eligibility can be accurately established without time-consuming processes, irrelevant references, and multitudinous documentary evidence.

The use of general assistance or other funds for interim assistance is an extra drain on State and/or local funds that would be unnecessary if eligibility under the Federal-State programs were more promptly determined. This additional drain often so depletes the funds that people whose needs can be met only through general assistance are deprived of adequate help.

Background

In September 1946 the State administrators met in Washington to consider, with the Social Security Administration, steps that might be taken to improve the administration

* Mr. Carlson is Regional Representative and Wave L. Perry is Assistant Regional Representative of the Bureau of Public Assistance, Region IX, Federal Security Agency. The article is based on information obtained from the State agencies whose experience is reported here and has been reviewed by them.

¹ A note on page 12 shows how a State agency in another region speeded up payments by improving fiscal procedures.

of the public assistance programs through the use of the additional Federal funds that Congress provided in that year. At that meeting, State and Federal officials recognized the existence of weaknesses in the application process. It was evident that one objective for the future must be the analysis and strengthening of the process so that anyone who wished to do so would be assured of the opportunity to apply for assistance and, if eligible, to receive assistance promptly.

Congress appreciated the merits of this principle and, when it amended the Social Security Act in 1950, added a provision requiring that assistance be given with "reasonable promptness to all eligible individuals." In using the wording "reasonable promptness," rather than more definitive language, Congress recognized that the States would encounter problems and would need to make some changes in their policies and procedures before they could reach the stated objective — prompt payment in all eligible cases.

The Social Security Administration, in implementing the congressional provision after discussions with State administrators, decided that a period of not more than 30 days for completing the application process in uncomplicated cases would be in keeping with the congressional intent. The Administration further decided that, when a State found a longer period necessary, the reasons should be fully explained and supported. The Administration also asked that a statement be submitted to indicate when the State proposed to complete the action that would assure adherence to a standard of 30 days or less in all but a few exceptional cases.

State Problems

The attempt to achieve prompt payments poses problems that are individual to each State. Hampering legislative provisions—especially those that prescribe in detail the content of the application form or establish complicated procedures for processing the application and authorizing payment—generally present the greatest difficulty. Established State fiscal policies, procedures, and controls that are beyond the jurisdiction of the public assistance agency may be of

particular significance in some States. An example is the legal requirement that compels the public assistance agency to depend upon another government agency to prepare the assistance check. Cumbersome organizational and administrative structure within the public assistance agency itself plays an important part in many instances, though defects of structure may be easier to correct than the legal regulations.

Unnecessary and unproductive procedures in determining eligibility also slow down the processing of applications. In some local jurisdictions the workers carry unreasonably large caseloads because of lack of administrative funds or because of difficulties in recruiting personnel. In some situations, too, there is a firmly held but unexplored conviction expressed in the attitude — "We have been doing it this way for years, and we must continue to do it this way if we are to meet our legal and fiscal obligations."

These problems are, without question, real; but with initiative, imagination, and an understanding of the objective they can be eliminated or reduced. The possibility of such progress is proved by the recent accomplishments of many States. Once having attacked the problems with facts based on studies of where delays occur, agencies are finding it easier than they at first thought to speed up their processes and to assure payment, in the majority of cases, in much less time than was previously required.

State Legislative Activity

In Region IX, during the 1951 legislative sessions, two States—Montana and Wyoming—looked at the problem of removing from the law cumbersome and detailed procedures. Preparation for legislation required considerable preliminary work by the State agency in reviewing its administrative methods and discussing the problems entailed with legislative members to determine the feasibility and acceptability of change. In Montana, it also involved discussions with the county commissioners, who constitute the local welfare boards, to determine if changes could be made without depriving local officials of the basic

authority and responsibility they exercise for the programs within their jurisdictions.

The Montana law required action by the county board and the signature of the chairman and one other member of the board to approve all applications for assistance. Since most of these boards meet only once a month, the agency viewed the requirement as a possible delaying factor, and it proceeded, after clearance with the county commissioners, to seek modification of the provision. The legislature did in some parts of the law remove the reference to the specific signatures required on an application, but in others it did not remove the requirement for action and signatures by the county board. The agency has therefore decided that it will rely, for the time being, on a requirement that county boards either meet oftener than once a month to approve applications or that they delegate to the county director the authority to act for the board. It has also established a process for making payment three times each month (the first, the tenth, and the fifteenth). On the basis of these changes the agency has fixed a standard of 30 days from the date of request for assistance to either the date of payment or notice of ineligibility.

In Wyoming, the legislature, at the agency's request, deleted a statutory provision requiring State approval of authorizations of awards. The agency, however, is not moving to eliminate the State approval process until it has carefully considered the possible effects—especially on the allocation of funds to counties. Deletion of the provision from the law, however, has left the agency free to develop more flexible procedures when they are necessary to make further progress. In the meantime the State has established a second pay date within the month; with this new arrangement it expects, in most cases, to be able to send the applicant the first check or notice of ineligibility within 30 days from the date of the request for assistance.

Procedural Methods

Several years before the 1950 amendment calling for reasonable

promptness, Idaho analyzed its forms and procedures that were being used in determining eligibility and authorizing payment. As a result of this evaluation, the State today has only four forms that must be used in every case to determine eligibility and process a payment. About the same time, Idaho began to include in its definition of an application all requests for assistance. This action not only gave further protection to the rights of individuals, but it also gave the agency a true picture of its workload and a factual basis for determining the exact time required to process an application. Experience has shown that the lapse of time between the date of request and the date of "formal application" is of real significance in many instances, and Idaho early learned the facts on this aspect of the operation.

Operating patterns that are well established are hard to change, especially when the job tenure of an individual employee may be affected. The Montana agency, however, which had been preparing assistance warrants in the State office by typewriter, changed to business-machine equipment. The change resulted in a saving of money and time and in the establishment of a later "cut-off date" for processing checks in new cases.

Through the use of business-machine equipment and with administrative processes based on a law that does not specify procedural details, Utah has been able to establish a continuous payroll plan. The accounting and statistical functions are completely centralized in the State office of the welfare department. Two report forms provide the basis for processing more than 90 percent of all assistance payments. These forms are the Certificate of Authorization and the Case Status Change or Closure. Regular checks are issued once a month, but a check may be obtained in between regular payroll dates by any county in the length of time it

takes for the request to go through the mails.

Under this plan a State study made in the summer of 1949² showed that, for 59 percent of all applications received (374 out of 631), payment was made within 10 days of the date of request, and that for slightly more than 93 percent, payment was made within 30 days of the date of request.

Fact Finding

Of basic importance is the fact-finding activity that must go on if an agency is to achieve the objective of reasonable promptness. Colorado has made a detailed analysis of the time required for the various steps of the application process, beginning with the date of request for assistance and carrying through to payment or other terminating action. In this way the Colorado agency has learned at what points undue delays occur.

Such studies not only confirm what has been suspected, but they also bring to light problems that were not known, as well as problems that are not directly related to the processing of applications. In one State, for example, a study of the application process in one of its counties revealed that the county director responsible for authorizing awards found it difficult to plan efficient use of her time. A "bottleneck" resulted that delayed the application process. Assistance from the State in planning better use of the director's time helped speed up the process in this county.

Of utmost importance is exploration by agency staff of current procedures and forms to determine if they are in fact necessary and serve a constructive purpose. In some instances the State law specifies that all State warrants must be issued by the State fiscal officer. Does the word "issued" mean that they must be processed in

² "Processing Public Assistance Payments in Utah," *Public Welfare*, August-September 1950.

the office of the fiscal officer, or does it merely mean that they must be issued over his signature? The writing of public assistance warrants in the State department that handles all State warrants may seriously handicap any effort to cut the time between application and payment.

Another problem of similar nature comes up when individual payments are posted to ledger accounts for each recipient. Is this process necessary for effective and efficient fiscal operations, or could the posting be limited to changes in an award? Are practices always considered from the standpoint of their essentiality and purpose?

Likewise, when several signatures are required to authorize an award, is there an evaluation of the reason for the signatures and a consideration of whether multiple signatures make the payment more "legal" than would a single signature? There are still instances where a certificate of eligibility is either forwarded to the State office for review or completed in the local office for review by the State field staff. Workers who have had experience with this type of form know that their preparation is time-consuming and involves a large amount of duplication of similar records, and that their value is questionable.

It is recognized that there are many other aspects to the problem of making payment with reasonable promptness. Each State has its own peculiarly difficult and challenging problems. Most of them, however, can be overcome or modified if sufficient interest, time, and patience in exploration and evaluation are directed at them.

Uppermost in thinking as this work proceeds should be the realization that the function of an assistance agency is to help needy people, and a needy person is helped best when the money he requires for the sustenance of himself and his family is promptly provided.

Notes and Brief Reports

Improving State Assistance Payment Procedures

The provision in the Social Security Amendments of 1950 that assistance be given with "reasonable promptness" resulted in recommendations, made by the Bureau of Public Assistance after consultation with State public welfare administrators, to improve the public assistance program in this respect. The experience of one State in carrying out the recommendations insofar as they involve fiscal procedures is summarized here.¹

In Oklahoma the Division of Finance did not believe it was possible to shorten materially the time between the date of application for assistance and receipt of the first check. At the time the recommendations were made, the division was finding it difficult enough to maintain established payroll deadlines without assuming any additional responsibility that might jeopardize the accounting controls. In the State, added work had been made for the division with the designation of the Department of Public Welfare as the official State agency to administer the old-age and survivors insurance program for public employees. Administering the new assistance category—aid to the permanently and totally disabled—had also added to the heavy load. These and other problems, including staff turnover, made the revision of fiscal procedures seem an impossible undertaking.

The recommendations, however, indicated that failure on the part of the State to act on an application within 30 days might constitute undue delay. Since the Division of Finance did not wish State action to be held up because of any inadequacies of the fiscal procedures, it determined to try to improve the procedures and to ensure that the system, which was geared

to speed and volume, had sufficient operational flexibility.

A review of fiscal operations was therefore begun to find out exactly how long it was taking to process a new certification from the date of application to the local office until receipt of the first check by the client. It was found that the time involved was excessive and that a correction of the situation was sorely needed.

In Oklahoma, certifications of assistance payments are received from the local office and processed in two control sections of the Division of Finance. The certifications and change-of-status forms are received in the predetermined control section, where they are checked and audited, verified, recorded, and balanced in an over-all master control ledger by separate categories, by counties, and by day's business before they are transmitted to the tabulating machine section. Thus this section predetermines the results of the day's business and establishes the various amounts against which the tabulating machine section must balance.

The tabulating machine section then key-punches the information received from the predetermined control section and verifies and balances the totals. Both control units must be in exact agreement on money totals and number of persons, by counties or in any other sequence desired, before the preparation of the checks and the check register is begun.

Before May 1951, checks were written once each month on a month-to-month basis. Checks were made out during the latter part of the month, postdated the first day of the following month, and mailed in time to reach the client on the first day of the month for which the assistance had been granted. A certain day in the month (which had been previously determined) was specified as the last day on which to accept changes that would affect the following month's roll; on that day the predetermined control ledger was balanced, and the total amount of the roll and number of persons thereon determined. After

the tabulating machine section had balanced with the predetermined control ledger, the writing of the checks and check register was begun. The checks were signed, inserted into window envelopes, sealed and stamped mechanically, and mailed from the office under one mailing.

Under this procedure it was not unusual for at least 30 days to elapse between the receipt of certification in the state office and the date the check was mailed to the client. A recipient for whom certification was received on June 29, for example, would not receive a check until August 1. The majority of the certifications were, however, processed in a much shorter period of time.

The solution to this problem was a weekly payroll on all new cases and reinstated cases that had been suspended. On May 1, 1951, a separate weekly payroll was established for each assistance category. The procedure provides that, for all new cases and reinstated cases received in the Division of Finance before noon on each Thursday, a check will be mailed to the client not later than the following Saturday. The predetermined control section maintains a separate worksheet control of the weekly payrolls and adds them into the over-all ledgers when the month's roll is determined; the work material is processed in this section on Thursday afternoon. The tabulating machine section key-punches, balances, and writes the checks on the following day. The checks are mailed on Saturday.

This weekly payroll procedure has shortened the time between the receipt of certification in the State office and the mailing of the check from more than 30 days to less than 1 week for most cases and to no more than 10 days for the most unusual situations.

When the new procedure had been in operation 60 days, sufficient time had elapsed to gauge its effectiveness. Staff had been gaining experience during the transition period, and errors observed were being corrected. The Division found the procedure to be thoroughly sound and certainly practicable.

¹ Summarized from material presented by J. Fred Spear, Supervisor, Division of Finance, Oklahoma Department of Public Welfare, at the American Public Welfare Association Conference, July 9-10, 1951, Oklahoma City.

OASI Beneficiaries Under Old and New Benefit Levels

When old-age and survivors insurance benefits were raised by the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act, the average combined benefit being paid to aged couples with both members entitled was \$42 a month. This level of benefits was established by a formula adopted in 1939. As a result of the 1950 amendments, a couple whose combined benefit was \$42 under the old Act now receives \$77.30 a month, an increase of 84 percent.¹ On the face of it, this increase in the level of benefits should have greatly improved the financial situation of the beneficiaries.

From 1939 to September 1950, when the new benefit amounts became payable, consumers' prices in large cities rose 75 percent. In the next 8 months there was a further rise of 6 percent, making a total increase of 85 percent in the cost of living between the time the 1939 formula became effective and May 1951.

This comparison of increases in average benefits and average prices sheds little light on the comparative "security" of the beneficiaries under the old and the new benefit formulas, because it shows nothing as to the level of living either benefit amount would provide. Before the significance of increased insurance benefits can be apparent, this question must be answered: How nearly adequate were the old benefits, taken in connection with the beneficiaries' other resources, to supply them with the minimum floor of protection contemplated in the social security program?

The latest study of beneficiaries and their resources by the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance was the survey made in Philadelphia and Baltimore toward the end of 1949. Bu-

reau representatives interviewed 461 men and their families, of whom 157 were married men with entitled wives. Entitlements each year from 1940 to 1947, inclusive, were represented in the sample.

Three-fourths of the entitled couples in the Philadelphia-Baltimore sample had money retirement incomes during 1949 below the local public assistance level. "Retirement income" as used here means all reasonably permanent independent income, including 12 months' insurance benefits. It does not include earnings from employment or any other probably temporary independent income, or any kind of supplementary income.² "Public assistance level" as used here means the maximum amount the local public welfare agency would allow a couple having no special needs for medical care, special diets, and so forth. In 1949 in Philadelphia this amount was \$1,008 a year and in Baltimore, \$960, for couples who lived in rented quarters. For couples who owned their homes, the public assistance level included actual expenditures for housing up to the maximum amount the welfare agency allowed for rent.

Nine percent of the entitled couples with retirement incomes below the public assistance level did in fact receive public assistance. Of those who did not receive assistance, 37 percent were living with relatives, and others received contributions from relatives outside the household.

Thus public assistance or relatives to a considerable extent subsidized the low-income beneficiaries. The beneficiaries who owned their homes—58 percent of the entitled couples with retirement incomes below the public assistance level—were in a somewhat better position than the others, and the fact of home ownership partly explains how many of the low-income beneficiaries were able to manage. Some had earnings or other temporary income, some used assets, and some

just got along on their meagre retirement incomes.

This was the situation in Philadelphia-Baltimore during 1949—1 year before old-age insurance benefits were increased by the 1950 amendments. Between June 1949—the midpoint of the survey year—and January 1951, consumers' prices in those cities increased 7 and 5 percent, respectively.³ To measure roughly the extent to which the increased benefits may have helped the entitled couples up to the beginning of 1951, the amount of the benefit increase was added to the retirement income of each couple, which was assumed to have remained unchanged otherwise, and the adjusted retirement income was compared with the local public assistance level adjusted for price increases between 1949 and 1951. For couples, the adjusted assistance level, including the maximum allowance for housing, was \$1,078 in Philadelphia and \$1,009 in Baltimore.⁴

By this measurement, half of all the entitled couples in the Philadelphia-Baltimore 1949 sample would still have had retirement incomes below the local public assistance level at the beginning of 1951, in comparison with three-fourths of the group so classified before the benefit increase.

Thus despite the larger benefit amounts provided by the 1950 amendments, many beneficiaries whose retirement incomes had previously been below the local costs of rock-bottom acceptable minimum levels of living were still in that position after their insurance benefits were increased. Welcome as were these larger incomes, and much as they helped the beneficiaries to a better level of living than they could previously maintain, if they were not employed their basic needs would still have to be met in part by the use of assets, help from relatives, or public assistance.

The changes in benefit amounts produced by the 1950 amendments compensated briefly for the rise in consu-

¹ The preamendment average benefit of an entitled couple (\$42 in August 1950) was adjusted by the conversion table to yield the postamendment benefit (\$77.30 in September 1950). Benefits actually paid to entitled couples at the end of May 1951 are estimated to have averaged about \$70 because of the entitlement of persons who were eligible under the 1950 amendments but who could not have qualified for benefits under the 1939 requirements.

² Beneficiaries with small retirement incomes not infrequently worked during the survey year, even to the extent of forfeiting their insurance benefits when they earned \$15 or more a month. Thus the survey-year incomes of some beneficiaries were larger than their retirement incomes.

³ For Baltimore, the period is from June 1949 to December 1950.

⁴ Computed figures; may differ from the maximum amounts the local public welfare agencies actually allowed aged couples in 1951 to compensate for increased costs of living.

mers' prices after 1939 but did not correct the original inadequacy of the benefit level established by the 1939 formula. Since the effective date of the 1950 amendments, further increases in prices have again reduced the purchasing value of benefits below the level established in 1939.

Social Welfare Expenditures in the United States

In the clash of ideas and ideals that characterizes the world of today, the goals of economic and social welfare stand out as stated objectives of all parties and all governments. Definitions of welfare differ, of course, as do prescriptions for achieving it. But, increasingly, nations and social philosophies are being evaluated in terms of social welfare goals. Impressions as to how the United States measures up in such an evaluation—as indicated in statements by persons at home and abroad—vary within wide extremes. Differences in points of view will always color the picture. There are some objective measures, however, that can be used to delineate the main outlines.

In this context, it has seemed useful to bring together certain basic information relating to general welfare and to government expenditures for welfare purposes in the United States. Data on government expenditures for social security and health programs are published annually in the *BULLETIN*.¹ For purposes of the present analysis, the term social welfare has been broadly defined to include, in addition, education, housing, and community development programs.

This analysis has been limited to the over-all national situation. A closer examination would reveal relatively advantaged and relatively disadvantaged groups and areas. The spread between the lowest and the highest levels of living within a nation is a significant aspect of social welfare for which adequate statistical measures have yet to be developed for most countries of the world. Nor has any

attempt been made here to indicate gaps in existing programs in the United States or to measure unmet needs. Such gaps and needs are serious and must be of continuing concern to all who are interested in human welfare. Nevertheless, in terms of current achievement, and absolutely as well as relatively, the United States has made notable progress toward safeguarding, assuring, and improving the general welfare of its people.

General Measures of Welfare

The welfare of any people should be evaluated not primarily in terms of government programs but in terms of the general well-being of the population. While there are many intangibles that cannot be measured, the over-all level of social welfare can be gauged in terms of a number of generally accepted indexes.

Mortality data give some indication of health conditions. In the United States the average expectation of life at birth is now 67 years. Not many countries of the world have a better record in this respect. The increasing life span of our population has resulted in large measure from a dramatic reduction in infant mortality. In 1950 our infant mortality rate was 29 per 1,000 births. Only a few countries, including Sweden, the Netherlands, Australia, and New Zealand, had lower rates. In most countries, the rate was much higher.

The United States has 1 physician for every 800 persons. More doctors are needed, but the rate compares favorably with that of every other large country in the world. Only Austria and Israel have more physicians per 1,000 persons.

The most recent survey (October 1947) showed a very low rate of illiteracy in the United States, with 97 percent of the population aged 14 or over able to read and write. In 1950, 84 percent of the youths of high school age (14-17) and 29 percent of those aged 18-20 were in school or college. About half the young adults aged 20-24 had completed 4 years of high school or had higher education.

Perhaps the best single measure of the standard of living of a country is its per capita income. In 1950 the national income per capita in the United States was \$1,576, by far the

highest in the world.² This figure is the more significant because income is not concentrated in a small class but is widely distributed among the population. The average money income of all spending units in 1950 was \$3,520; that is to say, had the total been divided equally among all spending units, each would have received this amount. Actually, half the spending units had incomes of \$3,000 or more, and in general these units included more members than those with incomes of less than \$3,000 a year. When the money income left after payment of Federal income taxes is considered, the spread is less; average disposable income per spending unit was \$3,220, while half of all such units had disposable incomes of \$2,850 or more.

Government Social Welfare Programs

The high standard of living of the American people rests in large measure on the increasing productivity of the economy, a relatively healthy and well-educated population, sustained employment, high wages and good working conditions, scientifically developed and prosperous agriculture, a strong trade-union movement, and increasingly cooperative industrial relations. These conditions depend in large part on individual and voluntary group action. From the very beginning of its history, however, the United States has recognized that certain objectives can only be achieved by all the people working together through government. Welfare programs carried out by local, State, and Federal government units have long had an important place in our national life.

Education.—Public education in the United States is the legal responsibility of the several States. The States have enacted laws and established a system of local school districts that operate free public elementary and secondary schools. Most of the funds required to operate these schools come from State and local sources—on the average, 39 percent from the

² In 1949, when the United States national income per capita was \$1,453, no other country had a per capita income as high as \$900. See *United Nations Statistical Papers*, Series E, No. 1, New York, October 1950.

¹ See the *Bulletin* for September 1951, table 5, p. 25 (Annual Statistical Supplement, 1950).

State, 59 percent from local sources, and only 2 percent from the Federal Government. In addition to public elementary and secondary schools, there are publicly controlled institutions of higher education that enroll about half of all college students in the Nation. In these institutions, tuition charges are typically small; most of the financial support is supplied by the State (or, in some instances, by a large city). In the fiscal year 1949-50, a total of about \$6.5 billion was expended for public elementary, secondary, and higher education—an amount equal to about 3 percent of the national income and 10 percent of all government expenditures.

Health.—Public health activities of State and local governments have been growing in significance since the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The Federal government now provides funds to help support general public health programs and a number of special programs, such as maternal and child health services, in all the States. The Federal Government also supports basic medical research and operates public hospitals for veterans, merchant seamen, and other special groups. Most hospitals for tuberculosis and mental diseases are public hospitals, usually supported and operated by the States. Many cities and counties operate public general hospitals. Of the approximately \$11.4 billion spent for civilian medical care in the United States in 1949-50, government expenditures accounted for about \$2.9 billion and private expenditures for the remainder. Total government expenditures for civilian health and medical services (including veterans' health services) represented a little more than 1 percent of the national income and about 4.5 percent of all government expenditures.

Social security and related programs.—About 85 percent of all employment in the United States is now covered by public retirement programs. The national old-age and survivors insurance system covers some 45 million workers, or three-fourths of those employed in an average week. The special systems for railroad workers and for most Federal, State, and local government employees cover an additional 10 percent. Almost 4 million aged individuals, or

Welfare expenditures in the United States under civilian public programs in relation to national income and to total government expenditures, fiscal year 1949-50

[Corrected to Sept. 6, 1951]

Program	Program expenditures						
	Amount (in millions)			As percent of—			
	Total	Federal	State and local	National income ¹	Government expenditures ²		
					Total	Federal	State and local
Total.....	\$22,775.0	\$9,902.4	\$12,872.6	10.4	34.1	23.8	52.4
Social insurance ³	4,695.2	1,903.4	2,791.8	2.1	6.3	4.6	9.5
Old-age and survivors insurance.....	784.1	784.1	—	.4	1.2	1.0	—
Unemployment insurance and employment service.....	2,081.8	213.6	1,868.2	.9	3.2	.5	7.9
Workmen's compensation.....	571.9	16.9	555.0	.3	(⁴)	(⁵)	(⁶)
Other ⁷	1,257.4	888.8	368.6	.6	1.0	2.1	1.6
Public assistance.....	2,488.7	1,095.8	1,392.9	1.1	3.8	2.6	5.9
Health and medical services ⁸	2,144.8	266.7	1,878.1	1.0	3.3	.6	8.0
Other welfare services ⁹	417.9	108.1	309.8	.2	.6	.3	1.3
Education.....	6,546.0	46.0	6,500.0	3.0	10.1	.1	27.7
Veterans' programs.....	6,221.4	6,221.4	—	2.8	9.6	15.0	—
Pensions and insurance benefits.....	2,249.8	2,249.8	—	1.0	3.5	5.4	—
Health services.....	749.1	749.1	—	.3	1.2	1.8	—
Other (education benefits and special welfare benefits).....	3,222.5	3,222.5	—	1.5	5.0	7.7	—
Housing and community development.....	261.0	261.0	—	.1	.4	.6	—

¹ For fiscal year 1949-50, \$219.2 billion.

² Federal Government expenditures (including expenditures from the social insurance trust funds, except State accounts in the unemployment trust fund) of \$41.6 billion; State and local government expenditures (including expenditures from the State accounts in the unemployment trust fund) of \$23.5 billion.

³ Because a substantial portion of non-Federal workmen's compensation payments are made through private insurance carriers, they have been omitted in computing percentages relating to State and local government expenditures.

⁴ Excludes veterans' programs.

⁵ Less than 0.05 percent.

⁶ Represents railroad and Federal, State, and local government employee insurance systems and temporary disability insurance programs in 3 States.

⁷ Includes hospital construction and medical research; excludes veterans' programs.

⁸ Represents vocational rehabilitation, child welfare services, school lunch program, and institutional care.

about 30 percent of all persons aged 65 and over and about 40 percent of the persons in these ages who are not gainfully employed, are receiving pensions under these programs.

The Federal-State system of unemployment insurance covers almost all jobs in industry and commerce. Less than 3 percent of the civilian labor force was unemployed in mid-1951, about the minimum that can be expected when workers are free to change jobs. Most unemployed workers receive unemployment insurance benefits. The public employment service, administered in conjunction with unemployment insurance, is available to all persons.

Every State now has a workmen's compensation program covering most workers in industry and commerce. Federal employees also are covered by a public program providing cash and medical benefits in case of work-connected injury or disease. The special retirement system for railroad workers and most of the programs for

government employees provide permanent disability benefits in case of non-work-connected disability, and the railroad program and four State programs now pay temporary disability cash benefits.

For those who would not otherwise have sufficient income on which to live, the public assistance programs provide monthly grants related to individual need. Public assistance is administered by the States and localities, with the help of substantial Federal grants-in-aid for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

In the fiscal year 1949-50, the total expenditures under the social insurance programs amounted to \$4.7 billion or about 2 percent of the national income and 6.3 percent of all government expenditures. Public assistance expenditures of \$2.5 billion represented 1 percent of the national income and nearly 4 percent of all government expenditures.

Other welfare services under public auspices include the school lunch program; the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program; institutional care for specialized groups other than veterans; and social services provided through public welfare agencies for children who are homeless, dependent, neglected, or in danger of becoming delinquent.

Veterans' programs.—For some purposes, the substantial Federal expenditures for veterans are appropriately classified along with other costs of waging war. The veterans' programs are also, however, designed to meet the needs of individuals and in considerable measure take the place of more general welfare measures. They cannot be omitted in any survey of

government welfare expenditures. Disabled veterans and the survivors of veterans receive pensions and insurance benefits. The Government provides comprehensive medical services to veterans for all service-connected illness and for most non-service-connected hospitalized illness and some nonhospitalized illness. Veterans are also entitled to special rehabilitation and welfare services. A special program of government scholarships and aids enabled veterans of World War II to continue their education. In the fiscal year 1949-50, total expenditures under these programs amounted to a little more than \$6 billion, nearly 3 percent of the national income, more than 9 percent of all government expenditures, and 15 per-

cent of Federal Government outlays.

Relation to National Income

Welfare expenditures under civilian public programs (including veterans' programs) in the United States in the fiscal year 1949-50 are summarized in the accompanying table.

These welfare expenditures, as broadly defined in the table, represented between 10 percent and 11 percent of national income in that year. They accounted for 34 percent of all government expenditures. The amounts from Federal funds represented 24 percent of Federal Government expenditures. State and local expenditures for welfare programs took 52 percent of State and local budgets.

Recent Publications*

Social Security Administration

COHEN, WILBUR J. *The Social Security Act Amendments of 1950: Legislative History of the Coverage Provisions of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Program.* Washington: Social Security Administration, June 1951. 85 pp. Processed.

Summarizes the coverage and financing provisions of the 1950 amendments, describes the changes in financing old-age and survivors insurance, and discusses each of the coverage groups separately. Limited free distribution; apply to the Social Security Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

ZISMAN, JOSEPH, and CARLSON, JULIA. *Seventy-Three Employee-Benefit Plans in the Petroleum Refining Industry.* (Bureau Memorandum No. 70.) Washington: Office of Commissioner, Division of Research and Statistics, 1951. 264 pp. Processed. This report, the second in a series of industry studies, summarizes and analyzes the major provisions of 73 employee-benefit plans in operation

in refineries employing approximately 139,000 workers. Limited free distribution; apply to the Social Security Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

General

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION. *Bibliography on Community Welfare Organization: A Selected and Annotated Bibliography.* Arthur Dunham, editor. (Community Organization Monographs, No. 4.) New York: Association Press, 1951. 35 pp.

BAROODY, WILLIAM J. "Some Effects of the New Social Security Act." *American Economic Security* (Chamber of Commerce of the U. S. A.), Washington, Vol. 8, May-June 1951, pp. 42-45. 25 cents.

BLUNDRED, ROBERT H., and HANKS, DONOH W., JR. *Federal Services to Cities and Towns: An Alphabetical Listing of Services of the United States to Cities, Towns, Boroughs, and Villages, and to Counties and Other Local Governments.* Washington: American Municipal Association, 1950. 81 pp. \$5.

BROWER, F. BEATRICE, and BALDWIN, MARY ELIZABETH. "New Group Insurance Plans." *Conference Board Management Record*, New York, Vol. 13, July 1951, pp. 241-243.

Includes a chart showing the main provisions of 10 recently adopted group insurance plans, nine of which

provide for both hospital and surgical benefits for employees' dependents.

CAMPBELL, W. GLENN. "The Economics of Social Security and the Theory of Government Finance." *National Tax Journal*, Lancaster, Pa., Vol. 4, June 1951, pp. 167-169. \$1.25.

DRESSLER, DAVID. *Probation and Parole.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1951. 237 pp. \$3.25. Designed for use by social workers and probation and parole officers.

MILLER, DONALD C. *Taxes, the Public Debt, and Transfers of Income.* (Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, Vol. 32, No. 1.) Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1950. 153 pp. \$2.

The chapter on social security taxes includes discussion of their position in the Federal tax structure and the shifting and incidence, as well as the allocation, of the employee and employer taxes.

WITTE, EDWIN E. "Social Security Needs and Opportunities." *State Government*, Chicago, Vol. 24, June 1951, pp. 150-153. 50 cents. Considers the broad aspects of the program.

Retirement and Old Age

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY. LIBRARY. *Selected References on Aging: An Annotated Bibliography, July 1951.* Washington: The Agency, 1951. 26 pp. Processed. Limited free distribution; apply to the Federal Security Agency, Washington 25, D. C.

GOLDNER, WILLIAM. *Pensions under*

* Prepared in the Library, Federal Security Agency. Orders for the publications listed should be directed to publishers or booksellers; Federal publications for which prices are listed should be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Collective Bargaining. Berkeley: University of California, Institute of Industrial Relations, 1950. 41 pp. 25 cents.

Discusses the background of pension developments and considers the technical and legal aspects of pension plans under collective bargaining.

LEWIS, FRED A., and PAYNE, THOMAS. *Service and Security: Municipal Retirement in Tennessee.* Knoxville: Published jointly by the Bureau of Public Administration and the Municipal Technical Advisory Service, University of Tennessee, Feb. 1951. 150 pp. Processed.

Describes and evaluates the retirement plans for municipal employees in Tennessee.

SHOCK, NATHAN W. *Trends in Gerontology.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1951. 153 pp. \$2.50.

Analyzes the problems of an increasing aging population and provides a basis for their solution. Considers trends in population, employment, income maintenance and retirement, health maintenance, living arrangements, education, and community programs for the aged.

Employment

CALIFORNIA. GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE TO SURVEY THE AGRICULTURAL LABOR RESOURCES OF THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY. *Agricultural Labor in the San Joaquin Valley: Final Report and Recommendations.* Sacramento: The Committee, Mar. 15, 1951. 405 pp.

Considers the problems of the seasonal farm worker from the standpoint of employment, health, housing, education, recreation, social welfare, and related matters.

MARKOFF, SOL. "Employment of Children and Youth at the Mid-Century." *Social Service Review*, Chicago, Vol. 25, June 1951, pp. 143-155. \$1.75.

Recommends the development of a Nation-wide program to provide better education and employment opportunities for youth.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY. DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS. INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS SECTION. *Maximum Utilization of Employed Manpower: A Check List of Company Practice.* (Research Report Series, No. 83.) Princeton: The Department, 1951. 54 pp.

An outline based on surveys made during World War II, as well as on observation of subsequent developments in industry.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR. BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS. *Brief History of the American Labor Movement.* (Bulletin No. 1000.) Washington: U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1951. 66 pp. 25 cents.

Includes a chronology of labor events from 1778 through 1950.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR. BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS. *Fact Book on Manpower.* Washington: U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1951.

"Selected statistics on the population and labor force in the United States, on its industrial and occupational distribution and on potential manpower resources under conditions of national emergency."

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR. BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS. *Occupational Outlook Handbook: Employment Information on Major Occupations for Use in Guidance.* Prepared in cooperation with the Office of the Assistant Administrator for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, Veterans Administration. (Bulletin No. 998.) Washington: U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1951. 574 pp. \$3.

Reappraises employment trends and outlooks in the industries and occupations that were described in Bulletin No. 940, issued in 1949, and adds recent data on earnings, training, and entrance requirements. Contains information on 433 occupations that are of major interest to veterans and young persons requesting guidance.

Public Welfare and Relief

Proceedings of the Workshop on Public Welfare Administration, University, Virginia, August 28th-September 1st, 1950, State Department of Welfare and Institutions and the University of Virginia Cooperating. Charlottesville: University of Virginia, 1950. 115 pp. Processed.

"Public Assistance Agreement Between France and the Saar." *Industry and Labour*, Geneva, Vol. 5, June 15, 1951, pp. 480-482. 25 cents.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR. WOMEN'S BUREAU. *Outlook for Women in Community Organization in Social Work.* (Social Work Series, Bulletin No. 235-5.) Washington: U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1951. 41 pp. 20 cents.

The fifth in a series of bulletins on the need for women in the social services, this report is concerned primarily with changes and trends.

Maternal and Child Welfare

ARNOLD, MILDRED. "Meeting the Needs of Children and Youth in a Free-

Enterprise Society." *Social Service Review*, Chicago, Vol. 25, June 1951, pp. 156-168. \$1.75.

Discusses significant developments influencing services to children and youth.

DULA, JOHN E. "Rooted in the Needs of Children: Use of Standards in Developing Services of Child-Caring Agencies and Institutions." *Tennessee Public Welfare Record*, Nashville, Vol. 14, July 1951, pp. 113-119.

FRANKEL, EMIL. *Juvenile Delinquents in New Jersey State Institutions (State Home for Boys and State Home for Girls): A Statistical Review of Current Trends.* Trenton: State Department of Institutions and Agencies, 1950. 23 pp. Processed.

LARSON, NEOTA. "Implications of the White House Conference for Child Welfare." *The Councillor*, Baltimore, Vol. 16, June 1951, pp. 1-6. A discussion by the Assistant Chief of the Children's Bureau.

PARKHURST, ELIZABETH, and SCHLESINGER, EDWARD R. "Basic Data Needed in Planning for the Care of Premature Infants." *American Journal of Public Health and the Nation's Health*, New York, Vol. 41, June 1951, pp. 712-715. 70 cents.

U. S. INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH. *Programs of the Federal Government Affecting Children and Youth.* Washington: U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1951. 126 pp. 55 cents.

Traces the development of these programs, describes their activities, and discusses the international programs on which Federal agencies cooperate. Includes a list of Federal programs by department and agency.

Health and Medical Care

CALIFORNIA. LEGISLATURE. JOINT LEGISLATIVE BUDGET COMMITTEE. *Analysis of Proposed Legislation Providing Assistance for the Permanently and Totally Disabled.* Sacramento: The Senate, 1951. 40 pp.

Includes a discussion of existing State and local services for the permanently and totally disabled, analyzes proposed legislation, and summarizes the committee's findings and recommendations.

"Insurance Against Temporary Disability: A Blueprint for State Action." *Yale Law Journal*, New Haven, Vol. 60, pp. 647-672.

Describes the four State temporary

(Continued on page 25)

Current Operating Statistics

Table 1.—Selected social insurance and related programs, by specified period, 1940–51
[In thousands; data corrected to Sept. 19, 1951]

Year and month	Retirement, disability, and survivor programs											Unemployment insurance programs					Readjustment allowances to self-employed veterans ¹⁵
	Total	Monthly retirement and disability benefits ¹				Survivor benefits				Temporary disability benefits ²			State laws ¹⁰	Service-men's Readjustment Act ¹²	Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act ¹¹		
		Social Security Act	Railroad Retirement Act	Civil Service Commission ³	Veterans Administration ⁴	Monthly				Lump-sum ⁷		State laws ¹⁰				Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act ¹¹	
						Social Security Act ⁴	Railroad Retirement Act ⁵	Civil Service Commission ³	Veterans Administration ⁴	Social Security Act	Other ⁶						
Number of beneficiaries																	
1950																	
July		1,852.9	251.6	155.6	2,343.1	1,063.2	137.6	17.5	995.1	16.0	10.1	31.3	25.5	1,158.2	26.9	45.8	1.7
August		1,867.1	252.6	157.4	2,347.6	1,100.0	138.5	18.5	998.2	16.2	11.6	30.1	33.6	982.8	21.3	44.7	1.4
September		1,917.4	253.6	158.5	2,352.6	1,108.9	139.1	20.3	1,000.7	12.0	9.8	28.3	31.5	805.9	13.8	31.7	1.0
October		2,061.8	254.3	159.5	2,358.2	1,120.5	140.1	23.5	1,004.7	11.9	10.4	30.7	33.4	651.5	7.1	32.6	.7
November		2,209.9	255.1	160.0	2,361.7	1,136.2	141.0	24.1	1,007.6	16.7	10.4	28.2	33.9	733.7	5.5	30.9	.4
December		2,325.6	255.6	160.8	2,365.8	1,151.7	141.7	24.9	1,010.1	19.6	9.5	27.2	32.1	832.0	5.8	34.9	.3
1951																	
January		2,432.8	256.3	161.8	2,364.9	1,172.4	142.5	25.7	1,000.6	33.0	11.1	29.1	30.3	971.7	6.0	50.5	.3
February		2,513.7	257.2	162.7	2,365.6	1,192.9	142.8	26.5	1,001.4	30.6	10.3	27.9	28.4	883.1	5.0	46.8	.2
March		2,591.6	258.1	163.2	2,368.2	1,217.6	143.7	27.4	1,001.4	41.8	11.9	30.2	28.3	807.2	3.5	38.7	.2
April		2,650.6	259.1	163.9	2,370.8	1,239.5	144.8	28.1	1,005.4	34.4	12.2	31.6	27.3	740.2	2.2	27.9	.1
May		2,704.5	260.5	164.5	2,373.0	1,264.4	145.9	29.1	1,009.6	39.3	12.0	30.5	24.4	773.5	1.5	19.4	.1
June		2,748.2	261.1	165.4	2,373.6	1,285.4	146.8	29.9	1,012.3	33.0	11.2	32.3	22.3	821.4	1.2	15.8	.1
July		2,798.5	262.0	166.2	2,374.9	1,300.4	147.5	30.8	1,013.5	30.1	10.3	29.0	23.9	747.8	1.2	19.5	.1
Amount of benefits ¹⁴																	
1940	\$1,188,702	\$21,074	\$114,166	\$62,019	\$317,851	\$7,784	\$1,448		\$105,696	\$11,736	\$12,267			\$518,700		\$15,961	
1941	1,085,488	55,141	119,912	64,933	320,561	25,454	1,559		111,799	13,328	13,943			344,321		14,537	
1942	1,130,721	80,305	122,806	68,115	325,265	41,702	1,603		111,193	15,038	14,342			344,084		6,268	
1943	921,465	97,257	125,795	72,961	331,350	57,763	1,704		116,133	17,830	17,255	\$2,857		79,643		917	
1944	1,118,798	119,009	129,707	77,193	456,279	76,942	1,765		144,302	22,146	19,238	5,035		62,385	\$4,113	582	\$102
1945	2,065,566	157,391	137,140	83,874	697,830	104,231	1,772		254,238	26,135	23,431	4,669		445,866	114,955	2,359	11,675
1946	5,149,761	230,285	149,188	94,585	1,268,984	130,139	1,817		333,640	27,267	30,610	4,761		1,094,850	1,491,294	39,917	252,424
1947	4,700,827	299,830	177,053	106,876	1,676,029	158,109	19,283		382,515	29,517	33,115	26,024	\$11,368	776,165	772,368	39,401	198,174
1948	4,510,041	366,887	208,642	132,852	1,711,182	176,736	36,011	\$918	413,912	32,315	32,140	35,572	30,843	793,265	426,569	28,599	83,598
1949	5,694,080	454,483	240,893	158,973	1,692,215	201,369	39,257	4,317	477,406	33,158	31,771	59,066	30,103	1,737,279	386,635	103,596	43,559
1950	5,357,432	718,473	254,240	175,787	1,732,208	299,672	43,884	8,409	491,579	32,740	33,578	70,880	28,099	1,373,426	32,987	59,804	1,666
1951																	
July	396,175	43,090	20,772	14,487	139,891	18,035	3,500	655	40,642	2,675	2,661	2,952	2,131	99,718	2,209	2,590	167
August	390,504	43,466	20,843	14,861	141,510	18,175	3,530	691	41,207	2,704	2,907	3,062	3,038	89,681	1,988	2,697	144
September	411,640	78,753	20,910	15,319	138,403	35,262	3,549	850	41,001	2,021	2,431	2,753	2,796	64,458	1,126	1,917	91
October	412,821	82,795	20,963	15,399	141,532	35,558	3,575	899	40,873	1,927	3,013	2,900	3,060	57,533	629	2,102	63
November	419,756	86,959	21,016	15,507	138,769	35,968	3,604	927	41,056	2,540	2,804	2,751	3,033	62,389	487	1,906	40
December	429,376	90,461	21,060	15,554	139,188	36,395	3,625	953	41,486	2,894	2,496	2,675	2,979	66,969	464	2,145	32
1951																	
January	461,640	93,885	21,113	15,825	139,445	36,998	3,647	997	41,642	4,779	2,846	2,974	3,401	90,475	553	3,037	23
February	441,934	96,486	21,184	15,815	138,160	37,605	3,658	1,009	41,865	4,314	2,648	2,508	2,350	71,369	391	2,555	17
March	449,759	98,933	21,255	15,921	139,140	38,326	3,686	1,006	42,833	5,815	2,998	2,980	2,591	71,584	315	2,360	16
April	440,052	100,694	21,334	16,046	138,046	38,942	3,719	1,081	42,832	4,705	3,151	2,957	2,432	62,294	197	1,608	14
May	451,242	102,267	21,424	16,224	138,356	39,614	3,749	1,133	42,552	5,385	3,053	3,097	2,252	70,799	146	1,181	10
June	448,150	103,545	21,462	16,296	136,336	40,164	3,775	1,151	43,179	4,501	2,984	2,880	1,999	68,780	97	992	9
July	447,533	105,140	21,522	16,411	136,877	40,580	3,796	1,193	43,325	4,121	2,688	2,861	2,023	65,917	105	966	8

¹ Under the Social Security Act, retirement benefits—old-age (primary) benefits, wife's benefits, husband's benefits (first payable Sept. 1950), and benefits to children of old-age beneficiaries—partly estimated. Under the other 3 systems, benefits for age and disability.

² Data for civil-service retirement and disability fund; excludes noncontributory payments made under the Panama Canal Construction Annuity Act to persons who worked on Canal construction 1904–14 or to their widows. Through June 1948, retirement and disability benefits include payments to survivors under joint and survivor elections; beginning July 1948, payments under survivor provisions shown as survivor benefits.

³ Pensions and compensation, and subsistence payments to disabled veterans undergoing training.

⁴ Mother's (widow's current), widow's, widower's (first payable Sept. 1950), parent's, and child's benefits. Partly estimated.

⁵ Annuities to widows under joint and survivor elections; 12-month death-benefit annuities to widows and next of kin; and, beginning February 1947, widow's, widow's current, parent's, and child's benefits.

⁶ Payments to widows, parents, and children of deceased veterans.

⁷ Number of decedents on whose account lump-sum payments were made.

⁸ Payments under the Railroad Retirement Act and Federal civil-service and veterans' programs.

⁹ First payable in Rhode Island, April 1943; in California, December 1946; in

New Jersey, January 1949; in New York, July 1950 (data not available); and under the railroad program, July 1947. Excludes hospital benefits in California; also excludes private plans in California and New Jersey except for calendar-year totals.

¹⁰ Represents average weekly number of beneficiaries.

¹¹ Represents average number of beneficiaries in a 14-day registration period.

¹² Readjustment allowances to unemployed veterans; from 1 to 2 percent of number and amount shown represents allowances for illness and disability after establishment of unemployment rights. Number represents average weekly number of continued claims.

¹³ Claims paid under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

¹⁴ Payments: amounts certified, under the Social Security Act (except monthly data for monthly benefits, which represent benefits in current-payment status); the Railroad Retirement Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; disbursements, for Veterans Administration programs except the readjustment allowance program; checks issued, under the State unemployment insurance and temporary disability laws and under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act; for civil-service programs, disbursements through June 1949 and authorizations beginning July 1949. Adjusted on annual basis except for Civil Service Commission data, which are adjusted monthly.

Source: Based on reports of administrative agencies.

Table 2.—Contributions and taxes collected under selected social insurance and related programs, by specified period, 1949-51

[In thousands]

Period	Retirement, disability, and survivors insurance			Unemployment insurance		
	Federal insurance contributions ¹	Federal civil-service contributions ²	Taxes on carriers and their employees	State unemployment contributions ³	Federal unemployment taxes ⁴	Railroad unemployment insurance contributions ⁵
Fiscal year:						
1949-50.....	\$2,106,388	\$662,262	\$550,172	\$1,094,406	\$226,306	\$18,855
1950-51.....	3,119,537	684,343	577,509	1,364,590	233,537	24,681
1950						
July.....	200,876	32,326	675	121,218	1,785	222
August.....	316,310	31,396	10,492	205,106	13,470	127
September.....	185,074	333,303	125,988	6,035	1,347	5,665
October.....	181,498	34,085	2,763	116,786	1,980	17
November.....	287,928	32,168	9,817	191,143	12,398	168
December.....	239,131	29,178	132,961	9,080	2,716	5,837
1951						
January.....	131,331	33,958	1,567	96,405	16,319	22
February.....	373,787	29,752	6,508	153,307	146,981	155
March.....	239,310	31,874	139,527	12,151	13,963	5,847
April.....	150,089	35,264	3,021	145,903	3,502	186
May.....	534,031	37,610	4,814	297,232	15,764	398
June.....	280,172	23,428	139,178	9,323	3,311	6,036
July.....	174,511	29,704	621	158,333	1,681	48

¹ Represents contributions of employees and employers in employments covered by old-age and survivors insurance.

² Represents employee and Government contributions to the civil-service retirement and disability fund (including Alaska Railroad, Canal Zone, and Office of the Comptroller of the Currency retirement and disability funds integrated since July 1949 with principal fund); Government contributions are made in 1 month for the entire fiscal year.

³ Represents deposits in State clearing accounts of contributions plus penalties and interest collected from employers and, in 2 States, contributions from employees; excludes contributions collected for deposit in State sickness insurance funds. Data reported by State agencies; corrected to Aug. 24, 1951.

⁴ Represents taxes paid by employers under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act.

⁵ Beginning 1947, also covers temporary disability insurance.

⁶ Represents contributions of \$28.3 million from employees, and contributions for fiscal year 1950-51 of \$305.0 million from the Federal Government.

Source: *Daily Statement of the U. S. Treasury*, unless otherwise noted.

Table 3.—Total Federal cash income and outgo ¹ and amounts for programs under the Social Security Act, fiscal years 1948-49, 1949-50, and 1950-51

[In millions; corrected to Aug. 27, 1951]

Classification	1948-49	1949-50	1950-51
Cash income ¹	\$41,628	\$40,970	\$53,439
Social security.....	2,897	3,431	4,716
Federal insurance contributions.....	1,690	2,106	3,120
Federal unemployment taxes.....	223	226	254
Deposits in unemployment trust fund ²	984	1,090	1,363
Other.....	38,731	37,639	48,723
Cash outgo ¹	40,576	43,155	45,804
Social security.....	2,985	4,027	3,818
Administrative expenses, Social Security Administration ³	52	47	56
Administrative expenses, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor.....		46	5
Grants to States ⁴	1,085	1,354	1,392
State withdrawals from unemployment trust fund.....	1,227	1,879	848
Old-age and survivors insurance benefit payments.....	607	727	1,498
Administrative expenses, Department of the Treasury ⁵	14	14	18
Other.....	37,591	39,128	41,986

¹ Cash income and outgo represent flow of cash, exclusive of borrowed cash, into and out of the general fund and trust accounts of the Treasury.

² Deposits by States of contributions collected under State unemployment insurance laws.

³ Includes administrative expenses of the Bureau of the Census in connection with searching census records for old-age and survivors insurance.

⁴ Includes \$1.4 million of administrative expenses while still under the Social Security Administration, July 1, 1949-Aug. 19, 1949.

⁵ Grants for employment security administration (including employment offices), for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, and for maternal and child health and welfare services; and, beginning in the last quarter of 1950, for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

⁶ In connection with old-age and survivors insurance.

Source: Total Federal cash income and outgo from *Treasury Bulletin*; other data from *Daily Statement of the U. S. Treasury*.

SOCIAL SECURITY IN REVIEW

(Continued from page 2)

as under the former State program for the adult crippled.

CLAIMS FILED by unemployed workers for benefits under the State unemployment insurance programs rose in July, in contrast to the experience of the 3 preceding years, when the num-

ber of July claims for both new and continuing unemployment had declined. In July of this year, initial claims went up sharply, 26.8 percent, to almost 1.1 million, and weeks of unemployment claimed (representing continued unemployment) increased 7.8 percent to 4.3 million. The substantial rise was the result of several factors, including the Midwest flood

disaster and lay-offs resulting from material shortages caused by Government restrictions, as well as the usual administrative and seasonal developments. The average weekly number of beneficiaries under the program dropped 9 percent from the June figure to 747,800, while a decline of 4.2 percent, to \$65.9 million, occurred in the total benefits paid.

Table 4.—Status of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, by specified period, 1937–51

[In thousands]

Period	Receipts		Expenditures		Assets			
	Appropriations, transfers, and deposits ¹	Interest received	Benefit payments	Administrative expenses	Net total of U. S. Government securities acquired ²	Cash with disbursing officer at end of period	Credit of fund account at end of period	Total assets at end of period
Cumulative, January 1937–July 1951.....	\$18,438,433	\$1,804,671	\$5,032,775	\$468,130	\$14,452,799	\$197,374	\$92,026	\$14,742,199
Fiscal year:								
1949–50.....	2,100,092	256,778	727,266	59,841	1,414,152	79,928	167,861	12,892,612
1950–51.....	3,124,098	287,392	1,498,088	70,447	1,677,976	200,456	212,311	14,735,567
1950								
July.....	200,876		64,788	4,519	210,000	88,284	81,074	13,024,181
August.....	316,310		63,998	6,212	67,000	148,162	200,296	13,270,281
September.....	185,074	10,871	67,158	5,657	162,918	152,843	155,828	13,393,411
October.....	181,498		120,928	5,136	130,000	174,825	59,279	13,448,844
November.....	291,622		127,517	5,361	35,000	184,203	173,644	13,607,588
December.....	239,131	16,714	136,917	5,249	80,908	188,401	202,217	13,721,266
1951								
January.....	131,331	115,074	141,717	7,086	197,700	204,080	86,438	13,818,867
February.....	373,787		151,700	8,265	82,000	195,393	229,947	14,035,680
March.....	239,310	10,871	154,830	5,674	166,918	205,039	143,061	14,125,366
April.....	150,089	7,916	154,685	7,137	66,966	206,309	71,009	14,121,549
May.....	534,075		156,806	6,642	211,500	205,918	230,527	14,492,176
June.....	280,995	125,946	157,043	6,507	267,067	200,456	212,311	14,735,567
July.....	174,524		159,131	8,761	130,000	197,374	92,026	14,742,199

¹ Beginning July 1940, equals taxes collected under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act; beginning with the fiscal year 1947, includes amounts appropriated to meet administrative and other costs of benefits payable to survivors of certain World War II veterans as provided under the Social Security Act Amendments of 1946; beginning May 1951, includes deposits by States under voluntary agreements for coverage of State and local employees.

² Includes accrued interest and repayments on account of accrued interest on bonds at time of purchase.

Source: Daily Statement of the U. S. Treasury.

Table 5.—Status of the unemployment trust fund, by specified period, 1936–51

[In thousands]

Period	Total assets at end of period	Net total of U. S. Government securities acquired ¹	Unexpended balance at end of period	State accounts				Railroad unemployment insurance account ⁴			
				Deposits	Interest credited	Withdrawals ²	Balance at end of period	Deposits	Interest credited	Benefit payments	Balance at end of period ³
Cumulative, January 1936–July 1951.....	\$3,068,215	\$8,029,197	\$39,018	\$15,061,621	\$1,333,107	\$9,094,841	\$7,300,387	\$901,613	\$135,497	\$449,396	\$767,827
Fiscal year:											
1949–50.....	7,437,896	—724,068	23,633	1,098,795	149,046	1,879,000	6,651,571	9,728	18,020	143,904	786,325
1950–51.....	8,079,232	649,933	15,035	1,362,629	147,662	848,270	7,313,592	14,884	16,465	52,034	765,640
1950											
July.....	7,380,064	—63,000	28,801	35,113	42	89,020	6,597,705	208	5	4,179	782,359
August.....	7,578,176	210,000	16,913	287,556		84,275	6,800,986	76		5,245	777,190
September.....	7,530,538	—45,007	14,282	9,322	3,664	59,950	6,754,022	3,399	432	4,504	776,517
October.....	7,507,116	—28,000	18,860	37,516	188	56,650	6,735,076	10	22	4,808	772,041
November.....	7,704,302	198,000	18,046	256,760		55,120	6,936,716	101		4,355	767,586
December.....	7,663,410	—47,027	24,181	21,884	5,823	68,145	6,896,278	3,472	675	4,602	767,131
1951											
January.....	7,666,316		27,067	34,463	63,563	96,425	6,897,879	13	7,147	5,854	768,437
February.....	7,800,319	139,000	22,090	207,792		69,440	7,036,231	93		4,442	764,088
March.....	7,758,020	—40,008	19,799	21,652	3,662	66,770	6,994,775	3,508	412	4,763	763,245
April.....	7,733,576	—40,005	35,359	39,247	2,445	62,970	6,973,496	112	269	3,546	760,079
May.....	8,052,016	325,000	28,799	393,384		72,125	7,294,755	270		3,089	757,261
June.....	8,079,232	40,981	15,035	17,941	68,275	67,390	7,313,592	3,622	7,504	2,746	765,640
July.....	8,068,215	—35,000	39,018	53,293	17	66,515	7,300,387	29	2	2,215	767,827

¹ Includes accrued interest and repayments on account of interest on bonds at time of purchase; minus figures represent primarily net total of securities redeemed.

² Includes transfers from State accounts to railroad unemployment insurance account amounting to \$107,161,000.

³ Includes withdrawals of \$79,169,000 for disability insurance benefits.

⁴ Beginning July 1947, includes temporary disability program.

⁵ Includes transfers to the account from railroad unemployment insurance administration fund amounting to \$85,290,000 and transfers of \$12,338,000 out of the account to adjust funds available for administrative expenses on account of retroactive credits taken by contributors under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act Amendments of 1948.

Source: Daily Statement of the U. S. Treasury.

Table 6.—Old-age and survivors insurance: Monthly benefits in current-payment status ¹ at the end of the month, by type of benefit ² and by month, July 1950–July 1951, and monthly benefits awarded by type of benefit, July 1951

[Amounts in thousands; data corrected to Aug. 21, 1951]

Item	Total		Old-age		Wife's or husband's		Child's		Widow's or widower's		Mother's		Parent's	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Monthly benefits in current-payment status at end of month:														
1950														
July.....	2,946,096	\$61,124.8	1,394,920	\$36,734.7	422,448	\$5,896.3	663,858	\$8,810.3	293,915	\$6,159.8	156,792	\$3,327.6	14,163	\$196.1
August.....	2,967,055	61,640.7	1,405,592	37,051.6	425,604	5,949.9	666,102	8,845.8	297,999	6,252.0	157,503	3,343.7	14,255	197.6
September.....	3,026,332	114,015.1	1,444,772	67,353.8	436,624	10,696.5	669,716	18,780.4	302,435	11,077.3	158,391	5,578.4	14,394	528.8
October.....	3,182,342	118,352.9	1,563,318	70,955.8	459,990	11,113.8	676,758	18,929.3	305,790	11,199.9	162,066	5,624.2	14,420	529.9
November.....	3,346,167	122,926.5	1,681,370	74,621.1	486,238	11,581.5	688,131	19,144.6	309,848	11,336.4	166,111	5,711.6	14,469	531.4
December.....	3,477,243	126,856.5	1,770,984	77,678.3	508,350	11,994.9	699,703	19,366.3	314,189	11,481.3	169,438	5,800.8	14,579	534.9
1951														
January.....	3,605,235	130,882.8	1,850,207	80,584.4	532,187	12,477.3	715,188	19,700.6	319,513	11,665.2	173,354	5,912.6	14,786	542.6
February.....	3,706,586	134,090.8	1,912,170	82,843.8	548,047	12,790.4	729,616	20,033.9	325,555	11,872.2	176,156	5,998.8	15,042	551.8
March.....	3,809,165	137,258.9	1,971,703	84,971.8	563,346	13,087.0	746,247	20,418.5	332,539	12,114.0	179,877	6,100.9	15,453	566.7
April.....	3,890,018	139,636.9	2,016,135	86,496.1	575,098	13,304.9	760,697	20,732.2	338,539	12,315.9	183,719	6,207.7	15,830	580.1
May.....	3,968,900	141,881.2	2,055,581	87,842.9	586,829	13,510.5	776,336	21,069.9	345,112	12,519.9	188,681	6,348.3	16,361	599.7
June.....	4,033,583	143,708.8	2,090,668	89,000.0	596,098	13,674.0	787,311	21,282.4	350,343	12,683.3	192,357	6,452.8	16,806	616.3
July.....	4,098,870	145,720.2	2,129,909	90,390.7	606,188	13,872.8	794,875	21,425.9	355,678	12,858.5	194,925	6,537.6	17,295	634.8
Monthly benefits awarded in July 1951.....														
	103,202	3,198.2	55,391	2,009.1	17,332	349.3	17,212	399.9	6,709	229.5	5,963	189.5	595	21.0

¹ Benefit in current-payment status is subject to no deduction or only to deduction of fixed amount that is less than the current month's benefit.

² Effective Sept. 1, 1950, under the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950: (1) husband's and widower's insurance benefits became payable; (2) the terms

"primary insurance benefit" and "widow's current insurance benefit" were changed to "old-age insurance benefit" and "mother's insurance benefit," respectively.

³ Partly estimated.

Table 7.—Old-age and survivors insurance: Number of monthly benefits ¹ withheld, by reason for withholding payment and type of benefit, June 30, 1951

[Corrected to Sept. 5, 1951]

Reason for withholding payment ²	Total	Old-age	Wife's or husband's	Child's	Widow's or widower's	Mother's	Parent's
Total.....	354,636	223,211	57,376	22,003	4,503	47,432	111
Self-employment of beneficiary.....	14,484	13,189	326	23	232	713	1
Employment of beneficiary.....	263,067	202,405	3,105	10,700	3,450	43,357	50
Employment of old-age beneficiary on whose wages benefit is based.....	54,713	48,676	48,676	0,037			
Self-employment of old-age beneficiary on whose earnings benefit is based.....	4,241	3,794	3,794	447			
Failure to have care of an entitled child.....	1,731	72	72			1,659	
Payee not determined.....	3,368	659	110	2,366	127	104	2
All other.....	13,032	6,958	1,293	2,430	694	1,599	88

¹ Effective Sept. 1, 1950, under the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950: (1) husband's and widower's insurance benefits became payable; (2) the terms "primary insurance benefit" and "widow's current insurance benefit" were changed to "old-age insurance benefit" and "mother's insurance benefit," respectively.

² As provided under section 203 of the amended act except for the reason "payee not determined," in which case benefit payments are accrued pending determination of guardian or appropriate payee. When 2 or more reasons for withholding are reported simultaneously, the case is classified under the first listed reason. In all other instances in which 2 or more reasons apply, the first reported reason is the one recorded.

Table 8.—Estimated number and amount of monthly benefits in current-payment status ¹ as of June 30, 1951, by type of benefit ² and by State

Region and State ³	Total		Old-age		Wife's or husband's		Child's		Widow's or widower's		Mother's		Parent's	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total.....	4,033,583	\$143,708,778	2,090,668	\$89,000,025	596,098	\$13,674,014	787,311	\$21,282,368	350,343	\$12,683,323	192,357	\$6,452,784	16,806	\$616,264
Region I.....	373,309	14,204,471	207,261	9,270,331	59,742	1,456,477	51,731	1,489,458	38,817	1,432,664	14,552	509,931	1,206	45,610
Connecticut.....	76,319	3,081,937	41,873	1,991,694	12,374	318,550	10,155	318,017	8,788	337,891	2,874	105,880	255	9,905
Maine.....	36,231	1,243,723	20,098	817,768	5,593	123,771	6,057	151,522	2,963	102,578	1,394	43,592	126	4,492
Massachusetts.....	193,113	7,417,143	107,635	4,843,220	30,976	762,201	25,805	758,620	20,305	752,679	7,772	276,707	620	23,716
New Hampshire.....	22,152	784,735	12,625	525,338	3,416	77,573	3,332	87,393	1,966	67,991	755	24,411	58	2,029
Rhode Island.....	33,315	1,263,861	18,683	833,494	5,468	132,482	4,197	119,709	3,626	131,493	1,228	42,486	113	4,197
Vermont.....	12,179	413,072	6,347	258,817	1,915	41,900	2,185	54,197	1,169	40,032	529	16,855	34	1,271
Region II.....	1,011,814	38,436,979	542,149	24,236,591	155,666	3,767,490	157,154	4,691,459	104,949	3,872,986	47,468	1,700,567	4,428	167,886
Delaware.....	9,414	349,877	5,053	219,921	1,370	33,079	1,604	46,156	969	35,665	304	13,082	54	1,974
New Jersey.....	164,151	6,429,286	87,771	4,040,716	26,284	655,882	23,953	761,819	18,519	699,254	6,927	254,480	697	27,122
New York.....	474,203	17,943,895	263,905	11,595,822	71,915	1,724,310	67,020	2,017,525	48,521	1,780,042	20,757	746,418	2,085	79,778
Pennsylvania.....	364,046	13,713,921	185,420	8,380,132	56,097	1,354,219	64,577	1,875,959	36,940	1,358,025	19,420	686,574	1,592	59,012
Region III.....	261,936	8,416,659	113,015	4,563,128	31,217	665,071	79,060	1,915,410	19,410	669,054	17,695	551,072	1,539	52,924
Dist. of Col.....	15,156	536,582	7,772	327,589	1,722	40,281	3,240	84,051	1,558	56,238	808	26,376	56	2,047
Maryland.....	56,546	2,010,859	27,710	1,173,167	7,379	171,660	12,264	340,464	5,791	207,964	3,108	106,880	294	10,724
North Carolina.....	66,094	1,871,150	26,801	942,881	7,225	137,079	23,758	518,351	3,940	123,427	4,947	135,725	423	13,687
Puerto Rico.....	294	9,160	61	2,549	8	198	147	3,732	9	354	50	1,680	10	750
Virgin Islands.....	31	912	14	558	3	76	10	138	3	114	1	26	0	0
Virginia.....	63,442	1,986,521	27,092	1,070,270	7,346	153,621	10,672	459,886	4,701	160,731	4,214	127,973	417	14,040
West Virginia.....	60,373	2,001,475	24,565	1,046,114	7,534	162,159	19,969	508,788	3,408	120,226	4,567	152,512	330	11,676
Region IV.....	495,625	18,062,452	245,210	10,787,733	75,846	1,788,127	102,932	2,915,051	45,550	1,698,441	24,287	855,051	1,800	68,049
Kentucky.....	62,168	1,881,784	26,291	1,010,459	7,852	174,486	19,461	443,825	3,953	133,037	4,229	125,680	382	13,377
Michigan.....	177,229	6,643,050	87,260	3,892,665	26,584	640,841	37,580	1,137,905	16,293	618,082	8,962	332,096	550	21,461
Ohio.....	256,228	9,537,638	131,659	5,834,609	41,410	992,800	45,891	1,333,321	25,304	946,422	11,096	397,275	808	33,211
Region V.....	529,687	19,267,845	280,856	12,043,979	82,845	1,916,089	92,993	2,681,132	49,114	1,787,077	22,047	770,364	1,832	69,204
Illinois.....	255,050	9,598,158	136,120	6,032,575	38,593	923,503	43,773	1,304,888	24,944	919,393	10,598	378,316	1,022	39,483
Indiana.....	116,774	4,072,308	60,366	2,494,277	18,616	414,107	22,355	622,678	10,271	364,233	4,797	163,463	369	13,550
Minnesota.....	64,506	2,259,000	34,837	1,435,813	10,162	226,927	11,322	307,416	5,188	188,039	2,833	94,741	164	6,064
Wisconsin.....	93,357	3,338,379	49,533	2,081,314	15,474	351,552	15,543	446,150	8,711	315,412	3,819	133,844	277	10,107
Region VI.....	317,082	9,509,368	142,016	5,392,618	39,267	790,040	95,025	2,081,405	18,014	591,538	20,651	583,689	2,109	70,078
Alabama.....	58,601	1,674,015	23,837	873,711	6,666	124,835	20,007	433,022	3,081	97,935	4,579	130,062	431	14,450
Florida.....	85,966	2,999,909	48,069	2,017,656	13,945	319,237	15,269	372,661	5,036	175,962	3,370	105,027	277	9,366
Georgia.....	57,122	1,615,013	23,334	838,712	5,969	114,084	19,920	427,039	3,374	108,277	4,049	111,225	476	15,676
Mississippi.....	24,461	642,441	10,130	333,956	2,796	47,155	8,316	169,379	1,133	34,661	1,841	49,212	246	8,078
South Carolina.....	33,571	908,649	11,710	427,243	3,119	58,830	13,755	280,801	1,908	60,631	2,834	73,095	245	8,049
Tennessee.....	57,361	1,669,341	24,936	901,340	6,773	125,899	17,758	398,503	3,482	114,072	3,978	115,068	434	14,459
Region VII.....	227,691	7,509,000	122,609	4,745,067	36,400	757,647	39,707	1,033,128	18,834	647,469	9,175	294,301	871	31,388
Iowa.....	53,313	1,719,327	28,580	1,078,563	8,906	180,925	9,142	237,934	4,415	149,195	2,099	66,630	171	6,080
Kansas.....	39,553	1,251,126	21,024	782,573	6,559	130,915	7,262	187,447	2,832	92,982	1,649	52,859	127	4,350
Missouri.....	99,054	3,416,324	54,046	2,186,491	15,257	335,968	16,541	434,048	8,947	318,629	3,809	124,373	454	16,815
Nebraska.....	22,237	707,810	12,124	449,011	3,637	71,903	3,740	98,004	1,765	57,894	899	28,518	72	2,490
North Dakota.....	5,768	173,197	2,945	104,526	791	14,952	1,343	31,687	325	10,670	336	10,389	28	973
South Dakota.....	7,766	241,216	3,890	143,903	1,155	22,984	1,769	44,008	550	18,099	383	11,532	19	690
Region VIII.....	244,896	7,380,298	111,606	4,093,306	30,156	576,965	72,020	1,725,072	13,801	458,469	16,087	483,768	1,226	42,718
Arkansas.....	30,838	845,385	14,716	495,880	4,184	70,598	8,488	178,492	1,465	44,560	1,784	49,112	201	6,743
Louisiana.....	45,809	1,382,641	20,727	762,352	5,224	101,560	13,425	313,702	2,852	95,870	3,277	98,526	304	10,631
New Mexico.....	8,538	246,942	3,253	120,409	839	16,233	3,345	77,045	354	11,901	708	19,969	39	1,385
Oklahoma.....	39,486	1,214,571	19,301	708,109	5,352	103,130	10,363	258,471	2,107	71,008	2,236	60,315	127	4,532
Texas.....	120,225	3,690,759	53,609	2,006,556	14,557	285,438	36,399	897,362	7,023	235,130	8,082	246,846	555	19,427
Region IX.....	75,821	2,547,176	39,044	1,553,252	10,965	233,151	16,965	453,599	5,129	183,773	3,465	114,027	253	9,374
Colorado.....	31,610	1,082,342	16,800	682,635	4,864	105,982	6,207	164,385	2,312	83,022	1,342	43,265	85	3,053
Idaho.....	11,979	375,633	6,383	234,394	1,654	31,904	2,831	72,909	585	19,565	485	15,292	41	1,509
Montana.....	12,942	439,661	6,888	271,152	1,708	36,515	2,725	73,822	1,000	36,876	555	18,803	66	2,493
Utah.....	14,275	477,419	6,199	253,865	2,098	45,211	4,088	111,757	964	34,962	876	29,751	50	1,873
Wyoming.....	5,015	172,121	2,774	111,206	641	13,479	1,114	30,726	268	9,348	207	6,916	11	446
Region X.....	479,779	17,746,521	278,509	11,960,934	71,198	1,654,438	77,695	2,242,530	34,948	1,276,348	16,149	563,371	1,280	48,900
Alaska.....	1,936	67,050	1,160	46,609	79	1,668	581	14,900	45	1,599	64	2,055	7	159
Arizona.....	15,809	535,748	7,450	308,977	1,952	43,918	4,550	118,832	828	30,051	963	31,548	66	2,422
California.....	319,835	11,960,809	187,581	8,091,232	47,685	1,120,856	48,921	1,450,317	24,350	895,541	10,431	369,502	867	33,361
Hawaii.....	9,625	305,642	4,698	185,022	981	19,479	2,902	67,256	409	14,049	612	18,970	23	866
Nevada.....	3,926	141,525	2,319	94,666	355	7,899	883	25,437	222	8,188	135	4,855	12	480
Oregon.....	51,236	1,840,347	29,719	1,247,053	8,048	179,719	8,310	233,819	3,426	120,166	1,601	54,551	132	5,039
Washington.....	77,412	2,895,400	45,582	1,987,315	12,098	280,899	11,548	331,969	5,668	206,754	2,343	81,890	173	6,573
Foreign.....	15,943	628,009	8,393	403,086	2,791	68,519	1,939	54,124	1,777	65,504	781	26,643	262	10,133

¹ Benefit in current-payment status is subject to no deduction or only to deduction of fixed amount that is less than the current month's benefit.

² Effective Sept. 1, 1950, under the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950: (1) husband's and widower's insurance benefits became payable; (2) the terms

"primary insurance benefit" and "widow's current insurance benefit" were changed to "old-age insurance benefit" and "mother's insurance benefit," respectively.

³ Beneficiary's State of residence as of June 30, 1951.

Table 9.—*Employment security: Selected data on nonfarm placements and unemployment insurance claims and benefits, by State, July 1951*

[Corrected to Aug. 24, 1951]

Region and State	Nonfarm place- ments	Initial claims ¹		Weeks of unemploy- ment covered by con- tinued claims		Compensated unemployment					Average weekly insured unemploy- ment un- der all pro- grams ⁴
		Total	Women	Total	Women	All types of unemployment ²			Total unemployment		
						Weeks compen- sated	Benefits paid ³	Average weekly number of benefici- aries	Weeks compen- sated	Average weekly pay- ment	
Total, 52 States.....	585,575	1,060,673	518,614	4,331,106	2,413,760	3,200,183	\$65,917,016	747,769	3,023,680	\$20.69	1,030,352
Region I:											
Connecticut.....	8,048	36,290	21,006	67,118	44,548	45,086	816,471	10,247	41,955	18.73	10,305
Maine.....	4,963	7,430	4,188	39,187	20,788	29,383	399,273	6,678	25,673	14.24	8,557
Massachusetts.....	14,925	49,348	24,782	252,614	143,767	199,698	4,346,102	45,386	184,207	22.70	56,280
New Hampshire.....	2,069	6,636	3,744	31,941	20,614	23,937	400,381	5,440	21,058	17.59	6,990
Rhode Island.....	2,120	20,456	11,795	97,557	62,682	87,269	1,815,008	19,534	83,793	21.12	22,215
Vermont.....	1,077	1,190	670	6,704	4,505	8,793	111,707	1,317	6,137	19.94	1,510
Region II:											
New Jersey.....	12,692	58,226	33,070	204,182	127,194	157,378	3,482,859	35,768	145,305	22.95	46,564
New York.....	67,220	218,175	* 122,832	939,829	* 529,124	682,704	15,225,958	155,160	659,564	22.30	215,586
Puerto Rico.....	610										
Region III:											
Delaware.....	1,833	1,532	586	5,430	2,918	4,047	69,525	920	3,733	17.68	1,179
Pennsylvania.....	18,769	107,965	54,786	361,610	201,972	274,970	5,403,525	62,493	248,688	20.35	82,931
Region IV:											
District of Columbia.....	4,040	1,245	525	6,439	3,098	5,293	95,324	1,203	5,173	17.97	1,509
Maryland.....	8,240	12,212	7,615	43,749	25,806	46,348	829,823	10,534	41,172	18.80	10,735
North Carolina.....	14,234	40,191	22,091	124,546	82,347	106,429	1,617,513	24,188	95,897	15.95	30,620
Virginia.....	9,429	10,337	5,304	55,246	38,235	49,659	744,199	11,286	46,963	16.29	12,653
West Virginia.....	2,485	10,093	2,126	52,887	13,739	40,652	703,539	9,239	35,333	18.41	11,775
Region V:											
Alabama.....	11,956	10,946	2,920	61,708	22,516	45,001	673,690	10,228	41,374	15.45	13,961
Florida.....	12,317	18,763	10,364	74,742	45,940	52,614	799,795	11,958	51,057	15.34	17,221
Georgia.....	12,352	10,852	5,911	65,849	45,318	83,745	801,184	12,215	48,906	15.33	16,097
Mississippi.....	8,549	7,289	3,182	34,189	15,622	25,929	394,022	5,893	24,126	15.57	7,739
South Carolina.....	10,698	16,561	9,007	46,883	27,518	32,239	549,318	7,327	29,638	17.74	10,961
Tennessee.....	12,566	13,997	6,576	109,227	61,467	73,024	1,113,610	16,596	68,825	15.62	25,556
Region VI:											
Kentucky.....	2,805	12,719	5,908	71,940	30,555	54,240	873,893	12,327	49,858	16.54	16,410
Michigan.....	12,362	55,416	15,234	173,381	63,796	129,247	3,256,320	29,374	124,508	25.67	51,161
Ohio.....	29,191	41,114	15,622	142,115	78,651	96,098	1,989,770	22,295	86,085	21.34	33,427
Region VII:											
Illinois.....	20,273	76,391	36,391	347,646	205,170	258,896	5,345,398	58,840	216,830	22.42	76,863
Indiana.....	9,313	29,302	12,705	94,801	48,027	69,098	1,440,648	15,704	50,540	22.17	22,880
Wisconsin.....	18,414	8,224	5,281	29,576	20,287	21,246	420,403	4,829	19,477	20.22	6,813
Region VIII:											
Minnesota.....	12,836	4,969	2,554	31,769	18,538	27,709	446,826	6,296	25,635	16.61	7,238
Montana.....	3,634	654	305	3,626	2,344	3,046	52,880	692	3,046	17.36	791
North Dakota.....	2,160	143	80	889	559	853	14,836	194	702	18.18	196
South Dakota.....	2,238	153	94	1,008	619	814	13,317	155	734	16.87	220
Region IX:											
Iowa.....	7,065	3,308	1,668	14,341	8,645	10,852	191,944	2,466	9,159	18.88	3,231
Kansas.....	14,635	15,718	3,803	21,529	7,832	10,872	220,759	2,471	9,657	21.25	5,473
Missouri.....	15,921	24,412	11,433	82,724	47,636	48,553	758,925	11,035	42,210	16.66	18,273
Nebraska.....	5,459	1,042	691	3,079	2,062	2,436	44,814	554	2,259	19.11	661
Region X:											
Arkansas.....	11,372	6,436	2,339	23,227	9,104	15,997	240,064	3,636	14,419	16.10	5,434
Louisiana.....	8,056	12,575	5,913	69,030	23,147	56,802	1,127,572	12,910	51,829	20.50	15,939
Oklahoma.....	14,646	5,375	1,922	30,050	11,397	21,598	387,094	4,909	19,981	18.43	6,801
Texas.....	65,428	7,284	2,862	43,576	19,991	30,343	473,534	6,896	27,956	16.14	9,783
Region XI:											
Colorado.....	7,512	951	446	6,183	2,927	4,790	88,549	1,089	3,937	19.47	1,373
New Mexico.....	9,804	1,111	238	4,309	1,162	3,575	62,758	812	3,374	17.86	1,105
Utah.....	4,785	1,727	650	7,815	4,593	5,030	133,374	1,348	5,101	23.04	1,753
Wyoming.....	1,611	228	113	1,182	466	999	20,109	227	738	22.51	261
Region XII:											
Arizona.....	4,858	2,391	665	8,612	3,581	4,971	101,686	1,130	4,740	20.68	1,973
California.....	40,358	63,286	28,303	356,326	215,677	316,304	6,741,810	71,887	286,966	22.14	80,862
Hawaii.....	958	1,321	467	8,831	4,741	6,476	101,967	1,472	5,099	17.68	(⁵)
Nevada.....	2,666	740	271	2,975	1,277	2,732	63,488	621	2,536	23.90	658
Region XIII:											
Alaska.....	1,148	219	146	2,911	1,789	3,194	72,390	726	3,052	22.80	(⁵)
Idaho.....	3,855	1,212	810	4,366	3,186	2,408	45,301	547	2,292	19.02	900
Oregon.....	9,511	7,976	3,363	25,073	13,968	17,359	358,130	3,945	15,886	21.51	5,019
Washington.....	11,509	14,542	4,257	36,879	16,325	19,547	426,625	4,442	18,495	22.13	9,290

¹ Excludes transitional claims.

² Total, part-total, and partial.

³ Not adjusted for voided benefit checks and transfers under interstate combined-wage plan.

⁴ Unemployment represented by weeks of unemployment claimed under the State and railroad unemployment insurance programs and the veterans' unemployment allowance program. Includes partial and part-total unemployment.

State distribution excludes railroad unemployment insurance claims.

⁵ Data estimated by State agency.

⁶ Data not available.

Source: Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, and affiliated State agencies.

Table 10.—Public assistance in the United States, by month, July 1950–July 1951¹

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

Year and month	Total	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children		Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled ¹	General assistance	Total	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children (families)	Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled ¹	General assistance	
			Families	Recipients										
				Total ²										Children

	Number of recipients							Percentage change from previous month					
1950													
July		2,796,769	653,491		1,657,706	95,857	499,000		+0.2	-0.1	+0.5		-4.9
August		2,805,011	655,583		1,663,489	96,255	485,000		+3	+3	+4		-2.8
September		2,809,537	653,693		1,661,004	96,619	469,000		+2	-3	+4		-3.2
October		2,798,711	655,251	2,244,576	1,667,790	97,194	58,250	408,000	-4	+2	+6		-13.0
November		2,793,712	649,931	2,226,685	1,653,151	97,491	61,050	403,000	-2	-8	+3	+4.8	-1.3
December		2,786,216	651,309	2,233,194	1,660,933	97,453	68,800	413,000	-3	+2	(⁴)	+12.7	+2.6
1951													
January		2,784,199	652,971	2,240,743	1,666,911	96,062	70,770	425,000	-1	+3	-1.4	+2.9	+3.0
February		2,777,722	651,928	2,238,185	1,665,048	96,065	74,567	421,000	-2	-2	(⁴)	+5.4	-1.0
March		2,771,640	651,356	2,236,472	1,663,919	95,905	80,002	412,000	-2	-1	-2	+7.3	-2.1
April		2,760,691	645,822	2,218,670	1,652,472	96,974	87,845	384,000	-4	-8	+1.1	+9.8	-6.8
May		2,754,884	640,606	2,198,894	1,638,116	96,990	97,079	355,000	-2	-8	(⁴)	+10.5	-7.6
June		2,745,285	632,649	2,171,426	1,617,893	97,024	104,230	335,000	-3	-1.2	(⁴)	+7.4	-6.2
July		2,737,549	618,369	2,123,823	1,582,218	97,235	108,907	324,000	-3	-2.3	+2	+4.5	-3.2
	Amount of assistance							Percentage change from previous month					
1950													
July	\$194,691,114	\$121,785,828		\$45,843,007		\$4,390,279		\$22,672,000	-1.1	-0.5	-0.4	-0.1	-6.2
August	195,145,237	122,687,714		45,956,225		4,412,298		22,089,000	+2	+7	+2	+5	-2.6
September	194,647,657	123,086,487		46,051,975		4,436,195		21,073,000	-3	+3	+2	+5	-4.6
October	192,265,677	121,124,389		45,811,754		4,463,099	\$2,399,435	18,467,000	-1.2	-1.6	-5	+6	-12.4
November	192,572,324	120,824,086		46,220,553		4,472,924	2,533,761	18,521,000	+2	-2	+9	+2	+5.6
December	193,264,021	119,954,750		46,529,002		4,480,867	3,033,402	19,266,000	+4	-7	+7	+2	+19.7
1951													
January	194,962,874	120,099,988		47,327,250		4,438,705	3,170,931	19,926,000	+8	+1	+1.7	-9	+4.5
February	194,437,286	119,131,206		47,857,550		4,454,255	3,383,275	19,611,000	-3	-8	+1.1	+4	+6.7
March	194,532,503	118,948,024		48,088,334		4,448,593	3,596,552	19,451,000	(⁴)	-2	+5	-1	+6.3
April	191,950,100	118,270,450		47,521,557		4,495,465	3,946,628	17,716,000	-1.3	-6	-1.2	+1.1	+9.7
May	191,037,004	118,929,307		47,021,843		4,523,461	4,399,393	16,163,000	-5	+6	-1.0	+6	+11.5
June	189,319,242	118,665,540		46,384,194		4,537,434	4,677,074	15,055,000	-9	-2	-1.4	+1.7	+6.3
July	188,139,013	119,299,917		45,002,602		4,536,590	4,847,904	14,452,000	-6	+5	-3.0	(⁴)	+3.7

¹ For definition of terms see the *Bulletin*, January 1951, p. 21. Excludes programs administered without Federal participation in States administering such programs concurrently with programs under the Social Security Act; beginning October 1950, includes data for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, the first month these jurisdictions were included under the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act. All data subject to revision.

² Beginning October 1950, includes as recipients the children and 1 parent or other adult relative in families in which the requirements of at least 1 such adult were considered in determining the amount of assistance.

³ Program initiated in October 1950 under Public Law 734.

⁴ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.

⁵ Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

NEW INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION

(Continued from page 8)

vention on this subject and the subject of advanced standards for first

discussion. In taking this action, the United States Government pointed out that the position taken was not that the instrument is now perfect but rather that, though there are a

number of points on which modification is desirable, the material developed forms a suitable basis for further consideration at next year's session of the Conference.

Table 11.—Amount of vendor payments for medical care for recipients of public assistance, by program and State, May 1951¹

State ²	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children	Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	General assistance ³
Calif.				(⁴)	\$47,077
Conn.	\$179,091	\$88,688	\$2,121	(⁴)	(⁴)
Del.		299		(⁴)	(⁴)
Ill.	435,123	38,434	12,159	\$8,470	400,978
Ind.	280,538	54,696	14,662	(⁴)	132,770
Iowa				(⁴)	144,063
Kans.	116,105	26,079	2,153	16,488	59,531
Maine				(⁴)	29,343
Mich.				(⁴)	76,518
Minn.	616,993	41,302	3,347	(⁴)	(⁴)
Mont.					109,048
Nebr.	140,180	9,172	382	(⁴)	(⁴)
Nev.				(⁴)	4,497
N. H.	55,809	22,665	2,302	(⁴)	(⁴)
N. J.		13,279		(⁴)	101,033
N. Y.	858,701	342,915	26,594	193,188	(⁴)
N. Dak.	19,476	2,849	236	1,299	22,082
Ohio	278,930	14,243	6,890		407,839
Oreg.					179,562
R. I.					48,092
Va.					3,560
Wis.	364,949	85,025	8,353	3,607	95,769

¹ For May data excluding vendor payments for medical care, see the *Bulletin*, August 1951.

² Excludes States that either made no vendor payments for medical care for May or did not report such payments.

³ In all States except California, Illinois, Nevada, and New Jersey includes payments made on behalf of recipients of the special types of public assistance.

⁴ No program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

⁵ Data not available.

Table 12.—Average payments including vendor payments for medical care and average amount of vendor payments per assistance case, by program and State, May 1951¹

State ²	Old-age assistance		Aid to dependent children (per family)		Aid to the blind		Aid to the permanently and totally disabled		General assistance ³	
	All assistance	Vendor payments for medical care	All assistance	Vendor payments for medical care	All assistance	Vendor payments for medical care	All assistance	Vendor payments for medical care	All assistance	Vendor payments for medical care
Calif.							(⁴)	(⁴)	\$45.22	\$1.43
Conn.	\$69.74	\$9.00	\$123.90	\$16.00	\$73.32	\$7.00	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)
Del.			72.47	.42			(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)
Ill.	47.22	3.68	90.78	1.64	50.74	2.88	\$48.84	\$7.13	57.83	12.03
Ind.	40.40	5.59	70.33	5.23	45.55	7.85	(⁴)	(⁴)	\$30.20	\$15.48
Kans.	51.77	3.00	86.66	5.20	53.80	3.26	53.00	6.44	52.52	19.49
Mich.									37.42	3.02
Minn.	53.43	11.14	95.51	5.19	59.64	2.91	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)
Nebr.	51.59	6.11	88.92	2.67	61.12	.52	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)
Nev.							(⁴)	(⁴)	24.72	6.01
N. H.	53.77	7.69	117.92	13.96	58.01	7.24	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)
N. J.			94.69	2.49			(⁴)	(⁴)	\$55.56	\$12.06
N. Y.	61.62	7.43	114.69	6.30	69.27	6.64	67.44	8.06	(⁴)	(⁴)
N. Dak.	51.60	2.14	106.34	1.53	53.77	2.15	55.82	3.49	77.64	41.98
Ohio	46.90	2.32	77.56	.96	47.25	1.79			(⁴)	(⁴)
Oreg.									62.74	24.67
R. I.									56.58	9.73
Va.									25.21	.96
Wis.	49.84	7.00	113.79	9.41	55.19	6.09	68.08	4.85	\$59.49	\$16.10

¹ For May data excluding vendor payments for medical care, see the *Bulletin*, August 1951. All averages based on cases receiving money payments, vendor payments for medical care, or both.

² Excludes States that made no vendor payments for medical care for May or did not report such payments. Also excludes States for which count of cases is believed to be incomplete.

³ In all States except California, Illinois, Nevada, and New Jersey averages based on totals that include cases of the special types of public assistance for which medical bills were paid from general assistance funds.

⁴ No program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

⁵ Data on vendor payments for medical care not available.

⁶ Based on figures that include cases receiving burial only and total payments for these services.

⁷ Not computed because count of cases believed to be incomplete.

⁸ Based on figures that include cases receiving burial only.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

(Continued from page 17)

disability insurance programs now in operation and concludes by recommending the addition of a new title to the Social Security Act in order to provide a single, uniform program with minimum standards for finances, coverage, and benefits.

NEW YORK (STATE). DEPARTMENT OF LABOR. DIVISION OF RESEARCH AND STATISTICS. *Union and Union-Management Administered Health Insurance Plans in New York State, January 1951.* (Publication No. B-44.) New York: The Division, Apr. 1951. 59 pp. Processed.

Summarizes the terms of 306 collectively bargained health insurance plans in operation January 1, 1951.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY. DEPARTMENT

OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS. INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS SECTION. *Insurance and Sickness Benefit Plans in Collective Bargaining.* (Selected References, No. 40.) Princeton: The Department, July 1951. 4 pp.

U. S. CONGRESS. HOUSE. COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE. *Local Public Health Units: Hearings, 82d Congress, 1st Session, on H.R. 274 and H.R. 913.* Washington: U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1951. 224 pp.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR. BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS. *Workmen's Compensation Problems: Proceedings of the Thirty-sixth Annual Convention of the International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions.* (Bulletin No. 142.) Washington: U. S.

Govt. Print. Off., 1951. 248 pp. 50 cents.

Includes Cooperative Relationships Between Rehabilitation and Workmen's Compensation Administrators, by G. S. Bohlin; New York State Non-occupational Disability Benefits Law, by Mary Donlon; and Rehabilitation Around the World, by Henry H. Kessler.

WEINERMAN, E. RICHARD, and ABRAMS, HERBERT K. "New Patterns in Industrial Health and Medical Care Programs in California." *American Journal of Public Health and the Nation's Health*, New York, Vol. 41, June 1951, pp. 703-711. 70 cents.

YOUNG, FREDA. "The British Experiment in the Rehabilitation and Resettlement of the Disabled." *Social Service Review*, Chicago, Vol. 25, June 1951, pp. 223-231. \$1.75.

Table 13.—Old-age assistance: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, July 1951¹

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from—			
		Total amount	Average	June 1951 in—		July 1950 in—	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total ²	2,737,549	\$119,290,917	\$43.58	-0.3	+0.5	-2.1	-2.0
Ala.	80,538	1,728,411	21.46	-2	+9	-1.7	+4.4
Alaska	1,613	92,382	57.27	+7	+1.0	+4	-3.9
Ariz.	14,295	720,006	50.37	+1.2	+9	+4.5	+8.2
Ark.	62,935	1,316,044	20.91	-6	-6	-7.1	-25.1
Calif.	274,271	18,355,704	66.93	-1	-2	+2.2	-3.2
Colo.	52,195	3,983,012	76.31	+2	(³)	+3.2	+19.9
Conn.	10,844	1,202,516	60.60	-2	-1	-3	-3.2
D. C.	1,582	46,346	20.30	0	+1.6	-8.0	-6.2
Del.	2,751	130,890	47.58	-3.1	-3.2	-3.5	+17.1
Fla.	69,160	2,680,064	38.75	-2	-3	-5	+10.6
Ga.	99,579	2,415,106	24.25	-2.1	-1.7	-2.7	+6
Hawaii	2,305	77,175	33.48	-5	-1.2	-7.1	-4.3
Idaho	9,619	454,718	47.27	-12.5	-11.1	-15.4	-7.4
Ill.	115,236	5,289,323	45.90	-4	+2.9	-8.3	-6
Ind.	48,152	1,701,560	35.34	-1.2	-1.3	-8.0	-10.4
Iowa	48,819	2,445,842	50.06	-1	+3	-1.1	-1
Kans.	38,273	1,885,609	49.22	-3	-2	-2.2	-3.9
Ky.	67,122	1,998,227	29.77	+2	+4.3	-1.4	+42.7
La.	118,677	5,521,378	46.52	(³)	-2	-1.0	-2.6
Maine	14,993	641,005	42.75	-4	-4	-9	-4.8
Md.	11,543	448,005	38.81	+5	+1.6	-5.1	-1.1
Mass.	101,614	6,302,114	62.02	(³)	+4	+2	-5.0
Mich.	95,394	4,489,939	47.07	-3	-3	-5.1	-4.9
Minn.	54,993	2,491,807	45.31	(³)	+6.5	-1.7	-10.4
Miss.	58,865	1,085,764	18.44	-4	-2	-10.1	-14.2
Mo.	131,641	5,695,555	43.27	-1	(³)	-2	-1.4
Mont.	11,653	600,864	51.56	-5	-4.3	-1.0	-4.1
Nebr.	22,665	1,048,076	46.24	-1	(³)	-5.1	-2
Nev.	2,799	154,091	55.05	+1.1	+1.1	+4.8	+6.6
N. H.	7,145	316,714	44.33	-7	-7	-4.3	-4.3
N. J.	23,166	1,141,904	49.30	-3	+1	-5.6	-5.1
N. Mex.	10,678	411,848	38.57	(³)	+7	+5.4	+24.9
N. Y.	116,943	6,215,928	53.15	+1.6	-5	-3.3	-6
N. C.	61,297	1,382,132	22.55	-2	+1	-1.1	+4
N. Dak.	9,016	455,257	50.49	-1	(³)	+5	+4.2
Ohio	119,602	5,340,375	44.65	-3	-1	-4.8	-7.3
Okl.	97,877	4,771,410	48.75	-3	(³)	-2.9	+4.4
Oreg.	23,197	1,260,735	54.35	+1	+4	-3.1	-1.8
Pa.	78,967	3,044,967	38.56	-1.0	-9	-14.0	-11.6
P. R.	17,818	136,315	7.65	+8	+7		
R. I.	9,721	441,107	45.38	-2	-2	-6.6	-9.1
S. C.	42,982	1,081,461	25.16	+3	+5	+2.3	+24.3
S. Dak.	12,058	491,518	40.76	-1	+1	-1.1	+2.7
Tenn.	63,891	1,866,355	29.21	-1.5	-1.9	-3.5	-9.6
Tex.	221,364	7,258,308	32.79	-2	-2	-1.9	-4.4
Utah	9,824	484,216	49.29	-1	+1	-3.2	+6.3
Vt.	6,877	262,716	38.20	-2	+4.2	-2	+7.1
V. I.	628	6,741	10.73	+2	-7		
Va.	19,464	429,669	22.08	-6	-6	-1.9	+3
Wash.	69,620	4,312,752	61.95	-5	-8	-5.7	-10.5
W. Va.	25,933	680,372	26.24	+2	(³)	-3.5	-6.9
Wis.	52,031	2,268,250	43.59	-1	+1.1	-1.8	-1.0
Wyo.	4,315	241,154	55.89	(³)	(³)	+1.6	+2.6

¹ For definition of terms see the *Bulletin*, January 1951, p. 21. All data subject to revision.

² Includes 4,068 recipients under 65 years of age in Colorado and payments to these recipients. Such payments are made without Federal participation.

³ Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

⁴ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.

Table 14.—Aid to the blind: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, July 1951¹

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from—			
		Total amount	Average	June 1951 in—		July 1950 in—	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total ²	97,235	\$4,536,590	\$46.66	+0.2	(³)	+1.4	+3.3
Total 50 States ⁴	94,432	4,423,595	46.84	+2	(³)	+21.8	+20.9
Ala.	1,563	35,988	23.02	0	+1.5	+4.8	+6.3
Ariz.	798	45,338	56.81	-4.2	-4.0	-4.3	-10.8
Ark.	1,951	50,451	25.86	+1	+2	-2.1	-17.9
Calif. ⁵	11,297	923,721	81.77	+9	+8	+8.0	+6.9
Colo.	356	21,207	59.57	+3	+9	-6.8	+1.6
Conn.	307	20,829	67.85	+1.7	+4.8	+13.3	+24.3
Del.	206	9,124	44.29	+2.0	+1.4	+6.2	+6.6
D. C.	259	13,382	51.67	-8	-1.3	-8	+24.8
Fla.	3,302	136,612	41.37	-6	-3.5	-5	+7.8
Ga.	2,864	83,128	29.03	-1	(³)	+5.2	+9.3
Hawaii	114	4,256	37.33	-9	-3.3	+2.7	+1.6
Idaho	208	11,127	53.50	+5	+7	-2.8	+11.8
Ill.	4,148	207,286	49.97	-5	+2.8	-5.2	+3.4
Ind.	1,798	69,544	38.68	-8	-8	-5.1	-5.7
Iowa	1,258	73,238	58.22	-4	-2	+2.0	+3.7
Kans.	639	32,457	50.79	-1.1	-4	-8.1	-8.1
Ky.	2,500	79,611	31.84	+1.0	+1.1	+6.4	+34.3
La.	1,869	82,666	44.23	-7	-6	+1.2	+4.3
Maine	646	29,527	45.71	0	+2	-3.3	-2.3
Md.	488	21,301	43.65	+2	+1.1	+2.1	+9.4
Mass.	1,567	109,242	69.71	-3	+2	+4.3	+9.2
Mich.	1,849	96,598	52.24	-2	-2	-7	+1.7
Minn.	1,152	67,083	58.23	+3	+2.1	+6.2	+9.4
Miss.	2,781	64,954	23.36	+4	+3	-3.5	-14.7
Mo.	2,799	110,840	40.00	(³)	(³)	-8	-8
Mont.	542	30,483	56.24	-7	-5.4	+3.6	+1.6
Nebr.	747	45,884	61.42	+1.5	-1.2	+5.5	+10.2
Nev.	57	3,355	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
N. H.	306	15,108	49.37	-1.9	-2.2	-4.7	-3.0
N. J.	783	43,463	55.51	+3	+3	+2.8	+5.4
N. Mex.	523	19,059	36.44	0	-2.0	+5.2	+19.4
N. Y.	4,175	252,655	60.52	+3.6	-4	+5.9	+10.6
N. C.	4,485	154,437	34.43	+7	+6	+6.7	+8.0
N. Dak.	113	6,159	54.50	+2.7	+4.7	-9	+13.7
Ohio	3,826	164,714	43.05	-2	-5.7	-1.3	-8.8
Okl.	2,621	135,407	52.04	+1	+8	-2.9	+7.6
Oreg.	393	26,314	66.96	-8	+8	+1.8	+9.0
Pa.	15,339	608,572	39.67	+2	+1	-1.1	-1.6
P. R.	464	3,338	7.19	-6	-4.9		
R. I.	181	9,796	54.12	+2.3	+1.2	+4.0	+5.3
S. C.	1,614	44,554	27.60	+5	+1.0	+6.5	+16.8
S. Dak.	219	8,352	38.14	-5	-2	-2.7	+4.8
Tenn.	2,727	103,706	38.03	-7	+4	+3.8	+3.5
Tex.	6,100	225,397	36.95	+1	-1	-6.0	-8.7
Utah	215	11,437	53.20	+5	-3	+2.4	+10.7
Vt.	179	7,599	42.45	0	+5.0	-6.8	+2.1
V. I.	48	497	(³)	(³)	(³)		
Va.	1,515	46,572	30.74	-3	+1.4	-2.8	+1.5
Wash. ⁶	847	62,463	73.75	+1	-3.0	+1.3	-3.7
W. Va.	1,075	33,460	31.13	-4	-4	+3.5	+3.9
Wis.	1,377	69,197	50.25	+2	+1.8	-2.3	+5.1
Wyo.	98	5,302	54.10	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)

¹ For definition of terms see the *Bulletin*, January 1951, p. 21. Figures in italics represent programs administered without Federal participation. Data exclude program in Connecticut administered without Federal participation concurrently with program under the Social Security Act. Alaska does not administer aid to the blind. All data subject to revision.

² Includes 573 recipients of aid to the partially self-supporting blind in California and 21 in Washington and payments to these recipients; such payments are made without Federal participation. For Pennsylvania includes payments made without Federal participation to about 5,100 recipients.

³ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.

⁴ States with plans approved by the Social Security Administration. See also footnote 2.

⁵ Approval during past year of plans for 3 States, including Pennsylvania with a large caseload, accounts for sizable increase.

⁶ Excludes cost of medical care, for which payments are made to recipients quarterly.

⁷ Represents statutory monthly pension of \$40 per recipient; excludes payment for other than a month.

⁸ Average payment not computed on base of less than 50 recipients; percentage change, on less than 100 recipients.

Table 15.—Aid to dependent children: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, July 1951¹

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of families	Number of recipients		Payments to recipients			Percentage change from—			
		Total ²	Children	Total amount	Average per—		June 1951 in—		July 1950 in—	
					Family	Recipient	Number of families	Amount	Number of families	Amount
Total.....	618,360	2,123,823	1,582,218	\$45,002,602	\$72.78	\$21.19	-2.3	-3.0	-5.4	-1.8
Total, 52 States ³	618,342	2,123,729	1,582,151	45,001,568	72.78	21.19	-2.3	-3.0	-5.4	-1.8
Ala.....	18,627	64,699	51,511	601,409	35.51	10.22	-2	+6	+3.9	+24.0
Alaska.....	662	2,167	1,565	49,066	74.12	22.64	+1.2	+7	+3.4	+37.5
Ariz.....	3,975	14,951	11,175	301,044	75.73	20.14	-2.0	-2.0	+1.4	+1.9
Ark.....	15,115	53,399	40,784	534,381	35.35	10.01	-2.6	-2.4	-14.6	-28.1
Calif.....	57,075	175,470	131,078	6,325,648	110.83	36.05	-3	-4	+10.1	+11.6
Colo.....	5,400	19,701	14,811	485,898	89.98	24.06	-9	-2.3	-2.0	+11.3
Conn.....	5,480	17,980	12,990	589,896	107.47	32.81	-8	-9	+4.3	-3.8
Del.....	714	2,755	2,105	57,737	80.86	20.96	+4	+13.6	+2.7	+15.5
D. C.....	2,009	8,058	6,200	194,174	96.65	24.10	-5.1	-5.2	-4.3	+26.4
Fla.....	24,855	81,420	61,004	973,382	39.16	11.90	-13.9	-32.7	-10.2	-20.7
Ga.....	19,391	63,623	49,133	896,266	46.22	14.09	+1	+1	+23.7	+22.4
Hawaii.....	3,349	12,563	9,755	280,855	83.86	22.36	-6	-6.4	-16.9	-21.5
Idaho.....	2,443	8,020	5,879	243,412	104.78	30.35	-2.0	-1.0	-7.9	-2.4
Ill.....	22,800	80,507	59,523	2,363,812	103.68	29.36	-1.3	+4.0	-5.7	+7.0
Ind.....	9,707	32,046	23,622	638,698	65.80	19.93	-3.6	-3.3	-16.3	-17.1
Iowa.....	5,171	18,052	13,403	508,978	97.40	27.92	-1.4	-1.2	-1.2	+23.7
Kans.....	4,646	16,363	12,311	377,619	81.28	23.08	-3.1	-3.5	-10.5	+13.0
Ky.....	22,860	80,411	59,002	959,262	41.90	11.03	-1.6	-2.0	-2.8	+9.0
La.....	23,337	83,978	62,125	1,153,288	49.42	13.73	-2.4	-2.7	-21.3	-20.3
Maine.....	4,472	15,582	11,334	329,116	73.59	21.12	-1.8	-2.0	+9.3	+24.3
Md.....	5,844	22,439	17,042	478,420	81.87	21.32	-3.1	-2.3	-0.1	-4.0
Mass.....	13,107	45,473	31,923	1,427,460	108.91	32.84	-1.3	-1.6	-2.8	-5.5
Mich.....	24,728	70,743	56,705	2,283,174	92.33	28.63	-1.7	-1.5	-10.8	-6.5
Minn.....	7,781	26,241	19,891	780,122	94.99	28.17	-1.3	+3.6	-2.3	+1.0
Miss.....	10,511	39,129	30,309	190,640	18.99	5.10	-8	-5	-20.0	-44.0
Mo.....	23,596	79,993	58,710	1,228,962	82.08	15.36	-1.0	-9	-10.1	-10.8
Mont.....	2,382	8,265	6,076	205,517	86.28	24.87	-2.5	-2.5	+3	+10.1
Nebr.....	3,332	10,783	8,025	290,630	87.22	26.95	-8	-4	-9.2	-3.9
Nev.....	27	94	67	1,034	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)
N. H.....	1,494	4,786	3,400	148,452	96.37	31.02	-6.9	-9.4	-8.9	+6
N. J.....	5,078	16,929	12,818	478,325	94.20	28.25	-2.8	-2.6	-8.3	-6.3
N. Mex.....	5,602	19,406	14,738	299,018	53.38	15.41	+3	-10.5	+8.4	+18.1
N. Y.....	53,424	178,411	127,017	5,775,344	108.10	32.37	-1.6	-1.3	-9.0	-2.4
N. C.....	16,322	59,353	45,479	748,400	45.86	12.61	-8	-8	+4.6	+10.2
N. Dak.....	1,684	6,218	4,601	149,006	88.48	23.96	-6.0	-24.3	-7.9	-17.7
Ohio.....	14,400	52,838	39,633	994,597	69.07	18.82	-1.8	-11.2	-2.0	+10.3
Okl.....	21,609	72,037	54,561	1,564,107	72.38	21.71	-1.2	-1.5	-5.9	+50.2
Oreg.....	3,279	10,282	7,489	319,316	97.38	31.06	-19.6	-25.5	-14.3	-19.8
Pa.....	37,784	134,481	99,489	3,227,766	85.43	24.00	-3.9	-4.6	-27.2	-26.3
P. R.....	11,598	36,862	27,319	104,390	9.00	2.83	+7	+1.1		
R. I.....	3,266	10,961	7,881	285,138	87.30	26.01	-1.5	-1.5	-14.5	-14.6
S. C.....	6,670	24,862	19,203	257,521	38.61	10.36	-4	-5	-11.6	+27.5
S. Dak.....	2,584	8,402	6,247	181,280	70.15	21.58	-5	+2	+9.1	+20.5
Tenn.....	22,359	79,676	59,705	1,060,642	47.44	13.31	-2.4	-2.4	-11.8	-13.6
Tex.....	18,683	71,889	53,476	873,508	46.75	12.15	-1.7	(⁵)	-2.0	+6.9
Utah.....	3,046	10,650	7,897	319,793	104.99	30.03	-1.5	-1.5	-12.5	+8.3
Vt.....	1,028	3,565	2,768	64,937	53.44	15.40	-1.3	-1.7	-1.2	-3.1
V. I.....	183	505	305	2,781	15.20	4.92	+2.2	+8		
Va.....	8,158	30,348	22,963	406,210	49.79	13.39	-2.6	-4.7	-1	+6.3
Wash.....	10,353	34,139	24,615	1,004,937	97.07	29.44	-4.9	-0.7	-17.2	-15.9
W. Va.....	17,363	64,092	49,385	1,002,933	57.76	15.65	+1	+1	-7.0	-3.2
Wis.....	8,532	29,082	21,389	914,232	107.16	31.44	-2.9	-1.6	-6.3	+4.2
Wyo.....	585	2,081	1,550	56,909	97.28	27.35	-4.3	-5.5	+4.5	+4.0

¹ For definition of terms see the *Bulletin*, January 1951, p. 21. Figures in italics represent program administered without Federal participation. Data exclude programs in Florida, Kentucky, and Nebraska administered without Federal participation concurrently with programs under the Social Security Act. All data subject to revision.

² Includes as recipients the children and 1 parent or other adult relative in families in which the requirements of at least 1 such adult were considered in determining the amount of assistance.

³ States with plans approved by the Social Security Administration.

⁴ Excludes cost of medical care, for which payments are made to recipients quarterly.

⁵ Average payment not computed on base of less than 50 families; percentage change, on less than 100 families.

⁶ Number of adults included in total number of recipients is estimated.

⁷ In addition to these payments from aid to dependent children funds, supplemental payments of \$81,675 from general assistance funds were made to 2,489 families.

⁸ Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

Table 16.—Recipient rates for specified types of public assistance in the United States, by State, June 1951¹

State	Recipients of old-age assistance per 1,000 population aged 65 and over	Children receiving aid to dependent children per 1,000 population under 18 years	Recipients of general assistance per 1,000 population
Total.....	220	33	4.4
Alabama.....	448	43	(²)
Alaska.....	(²)	(²)	.9
Arizona.....	319	39	(²)
Arkansas.....	425	60	1.8
California.....	317	44	4.6
Colorado.....	416	34	3.2
Connecticut.....	112	24	(²)
Delaware.....	60	22	(²)
Dist. of Col.....	60	35	1.2
Florida.....	292	64	(²)
Georgia.....	463	38	1.6
Hawaii.....	121	54	9.6
Idaho.....	253	27	.6
Illinois.....	154	25	6.0
Indiana.....	135	20	5.0
Iowa.....	179	17	2.3
Kansas.....	198	22	2.4
Kentucky.....	285	67	2.3
Louisiana.....	671	66	2.5
Maine.....	161	39	9.4
Maryland.....	70	25	1.9
Massachusetts.....	225	25	7.6
Michigan.....	211	28	6.5
Minnesota.....	204	21	3.7
Mississippi.....	416	36	.6
Missouri.....	309	62	7.0
Montana.....	230	32	2.1
Nebraska.....	174	20	2.1
Nevada.....	252	*1	4.0
New Hampshire.....	124	25	5.0
New Jersey.....	57	10	*3.4
New Mexico.....	323	49	1.4
New York.....	90	32	5.3
North Carolina.....	273	60	1.4
North Dakota.....	187	22	1.9
Ohio.....	188	18	5.7
Oklahoma.....	506	75	(²)
Oregon.....	174	22	5.2
Pennsylvania.....	80	33	3.1
Puerto Rico.....	210	25	2.6
Rhode Island.....	138	36	10.0
South Carolina.....	373	23	1.9
South Dakota.....	218	27	3.3
Tennessee.....	280	52	1.4
Texas.....	424	22	(²)
Utah.....	232	30	2.8
Vermont.....	174	23	(²)
Virgin Islands.....	(²)	(²)	9.7
Virginia.....	91	20	(²)
Washington.....	331	59	5.0
West Virginia.....	187	67	3.7
Wisconsin.....	168	21	3.3
Wyoming.....	238	16	.9

¹ Based on Census data, April 1950. For a few States the populations 65 years and over and for most States the populations under 18 years are preliminary estimates. All recipient rates subject to revision.

² Less than 0.05.

³ Population data not available.

⁴ Number of persons aided not currently available.

⁵ Includes unknown number of persons receiving medical care, hospitalization, and burial only.

⁶ Program administered without Federal participation.

Table 17.—Aid to the permanently and totally disabled: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, July 1951¹

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients	
		Total amount	Average
Total ²	108,907	\$4,847,904	\$44.51
Alabama	8,611	187,569	21.79
Colorado	2,698	126,371	46.84
Delaware	102	3,869	37.93
District of Columbia	930	49,740	53.48
Hawaii	912	40,046	43.91
Idaho	667	32,427	48.62
Illinois	1,537	70,417	45.81
Kansas	2,591	121,620	46.94
Louisiana	14,759	460,666	31.21
Maryland	2,301	102,195	44.41
Michigan	777	44,999	57.91
Mississippi	501	8,525	17.02
Missouri	8,438	391,965	46.45
Montana	921	51,278	55.68
New Mexico	1,455	57,186	39.30
New York	25,731	1,480,414	57.53
North Carolina	2,847	75,915	26.66
North Dakota	498	26,731	53.68
Ohio	2,936	125,652	42.80
Oregon	1,475	97,339	65.99
Pennsylvania	15,007	644,527	42.95
Rhode Island	51	3,008	58.98
South Carolina	2,616	83,937	32.09
Utah	1,574	84,771	53.86
Vermont	174	6,734	38.70
Virgin Islands	23	261	(³)
Virginia	1,933	64,535	33.39
Washington	5,003	311,783	62.32
West Virginia	579	18,391	31.76
Wisconsin	788	50,110	63.59
Wyoming	472	24,873	52.70

¹ For definition of terms see the *Bulletin*, January 1951, p. 21. Figures in italics represent programs under State plans not yet approved by the Social Security Administration. All data subject to revision.

² Represents States reporting plans in operation.

³ Average payment not computed on base of less than 50 recipients.

Table 18.—General assistance: Cases and payments to cases, by State, July 1951¹

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of cases	Payments to cases		Percentage change from—			
		Total amount	Average	June 1951 in—		July 1950 in—	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total ²	324,000	\$14,452,000	\$44.61	-3.2	-4.0	-35.1	-36.3
Ala.	107	2,464	23.03	(³)	(³)	-98.8	-97.7
Alaska	71	2,633	37.08	(³)	(³)	-32.4	-16.7
Ariz.	1,148	45,459	39.60	-0.0	-17.0	-22.8	-0.0
Ark.	2,532	32,980	13.03	+5	+7	-3.4	-1.2
Calif.	29,948	1,350,192	45.08	-2.0	-2.8	-21.8	-22.7
Colo.	2,027	76,062	37.52	-15.3	-16.7	-53.6	-52.6
Conn.	3,683	180,039	48.88	-5	-4.8	-32.0	-33.3
Del.	875	27,875	31.86	-4.5	-8.7	-24.9	-26.9
D. C.	810	45,172	55.77	-13.2	-11.5	-50.4	-36.6
Fla.	4,900	76,000					
Ga.	3,104	51,315	16.53	-5.9	-9.9	-4.9	+2.2
Hawaii	2,641	131,695	49.87	-7.5	-8.1	-36.8	-38.5
Idaho	221	7,727	34.96	-7.5	-7.4	-56.9	-53.5
Ill.	28,036	1,469,389	52.41	-2.3	+3.9	-28.7	-23.2
Ind.	8,266	251,208	30.39	-2.5	-2.0	-31.3	-20.9
Iowa	3,236	86,163	26.63	+1.8	-2.0	-11.6	-8.3
Kans.	2,242	93,285	41.61	-3.2	-2.5	-52.1	-45.9
Ky.	2,635	69,047	26.20	+3.9	+4.1	-9.1	+2.3
La.	6,007	178,659	29.74	+9	-1	-78.1	-77.2
Maine	3,061	125,555	41.02	-5.1	-3.0	-19.1	-17.2
Md.	3,645	166,326	45.63	-5.2	-5.7	-33.4	-29.2
Mass.	18,772	955,318	50.89	-1.0	-2.3	-19.0	-18.0
Mich.	18,846	721,598	38.29	-1.3	-0.8	-23.6	-32.3
Minn.	5,176	235,028	45.41	-4.6	-2.2	-16.4	-9.4
Miss.	604	10,948	11.48	+5.4	+2.5	+32.3	+36.3
Mo.	10,703	324,140	30.28	-2.7	-2.6	-37.5	-42.4
Mont.	641	18,206	28.40	+1.1	-9.4	-49.0	-62.0
Nebr.	1,280	45,488	35.54	-6.8	-3.3	-8.2	-1.1
Nev.	350	10,500	30.00	0	+2.9	+16.7	+8.3
N. H.	1,143	40,293	35.25	-2.1	-12.7	-33.9	-39.9
N. J.	7,696	435,376	56.57	-4.2	-5.2	-33.7	-34.2
N. Mex.	890	12,944	21.94	-12.9	-14.6	-65.3	-68.1
N. Y.	52,413	3,914,370	74.68	-4.7	-4.6	-40.4	-37.2
N. C.	2,367	42,044	17.76	-6.1	-1.3	-39.6	-28.2
N. Dak.	391	13,739	35.14	-9.1	-6.3	-48.6	-48.5
Ohio	19,565	768,477	39.28	-3.2	-4.6	-33.1	-36.6
Okla.	8,000	106,017	(¹¹)	(¹¹)	-10.9	(¹¹)	-2
Oreg.	3,702	218,174	58.93	-5.2	-9.8	-31.7	-24.6
Pa.	19,308	931,110	48.48	-7.1	-6.5	-58.6	-61.3
P. R.	5,727	41,385	7.23	-1.3	-4		
R. I.	4,021	223,725	55.64	-2	+3.4	-39.4	-42.3
S. C.	2,922	50,501	17.28	-7.1	-8.6	(¹²)	(¹²)
S. Dak.	659	17,292	26.24	-22.9	-29.5	-10.0	-6.8
Tenn.	1,990	24,150	12.14	-3.8	-7.6	-8.8	-12.0
Tex.	17,100	133,000					
Utah	1,158	59,141	51.07	-2.9	-7.1	-52.3	-45.8
Vt.	1,100	35,000					
V. I.	225	2,181	9.69	+4	+5		
Va.	3,012	76,554	25.42	-10.4	-13.6	-37.8	-35.6
Wash.	7,362	395,350	53.70	-6.4	-6.6	-45.8	-47.5
W. Va.	4,789	106,215	22.18	-3.1	-3.3	-9.9	-11.1
Wis.	4,768	228,229	47.87	-1.7	-3.9	-29.7	-28.9
Wyo.	100	3,396	33.96	-4.8	-8.6	-78.3	-84.3

¹ For definition of terms see the *Bulletin*, January 1951, p. 21. All data subject to revision.

² Partly estimated; does not represent sum of State figures because total excludes for Indiana and New Jersey payments made for, and an estimated number of cases receiving, medical care, hospitalization, and burial only.

³ Percentage change not computed on base of less than 100 cases.

⁴ State program only; excludes program administered by local officials.

⁵ About 11 percent of this total is estimated.

⁶ Partly estimated.

⁷ Excludes assistance in kind and cases receiving assistance in kind only and, for a few counties, cash payments and cases receiving cash payments. Amount of payments shown represents about 60 percent of total.

⁸ Includes unknown number of cases receiving medical care, hospitalization, and burial only, and total payments for these services.

⁹ Includes cases receiving medical care only.

¹⁰ Includes 4,854 cases and payments of \$139,199 representing supplementation of other assistance programs.

¹¹ Excludes estimated duplication between programs; 1,544 cases were aided by county commissioners and 6,882 cases under program administered by State Board of Public Welfare. Average per case and percentage changes not computed.

¹² Not computed; comparable data not available.

¹³ Estimated.

¹⁴ Estimated on basis of reports from a sample of cities and towns.